THE

Canada Temperance Manual

AND

PROHIBITIONIST'S HANDBOOK.

BY

PROF. GEORGE E. FOSTER, M.P.

PRICE 20 CENTS.

Montreal:
"WITNESS" PRINTING HOUSE, ST. JAMES STREET WEST.
1884.

THE

Canada Temperance Manual

AND

PROHIBITIONIST'S HANDBOOK.

BY

PROF. GEORGE E. FOSTER, M.P.

PRICE 20 CENTS.

Montreal:
"WITNESS" PRINTING HOUSE, ST. JAMES STREET WEST.
1884.

Entered according to Act of Parliament of Canada, in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty-four, by GEORGE E. FOSTER, in the Office of the Minister of Agriculture.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTORY ..... Pages 1-4

CHAPTER I.—The nature of the Act—Government by the People—Non-partizan—Majority sentiment—Revenue objection—Manufacturing interests—Dealers' interests—The Community's interest—Educational tendency ..... Pages 5-8

CHAPTER II.—The provisions of the Act—Prohibitions—Penalties—Prosecutions—Appeals—Evidence—Enforcement ..... Pages 9-15

CHAPTER III.—How the Act has been received—Counties and Cities voted—Its enforcement—Fredericton—Woodstock—St. Stephen—P.E. Island—Halton ..... Pages 16-27

CHAPTER IV.—Prohibition in Maine—History of Law—Individual testimonies—Official Evidence—*Globe* Correspondents—Anti-Prohibitionist's Testimony—Prohibitionist's Testimony ..... Pages 28-38

CHAPTER V.—Prohibition in Massachusetts—History of Law—Testimony to its effects—License Law of 1868 and Testimony as to its results—Official statistics—The Test of 1874 and 1877—Conclusion ..... Pages 39-48

CHAPTER VI.—Other examples of Prohibition—Bessbrook—Tyrone—Sunday closing in Ireland and Scotland—Canterbury—English estates—Low Moor—Shaftesbury Park—Saltaire—Vermont—Potter County—Maryland—Vineland—Carrol County - Edward's County—General survey ..... Pages 49-65

CHAPTER VII.—Comparative statistics—Ontario's Crime—Maine's crime—The two compared—Canada and Maine—Hamilton, Belleville, Toronto, Bangor, Portland, Lewiston and Auburn compared—Maine and Connecticut—Maine and other States ..... Pages 66-75

CHAPTER VIII.—Objections answered—Partial Prohibition—The Dunkin Act—The Barley Question—Sobriety by Act of Parliament—Tyrannical and un-British ..... Pages 76-93

CHAPTER IX.—Objections answered—Ruin to the country—Revenue and Taxes—Moral Suasion sufficient—Compensation—Right of Search ..... Pages 94-100

CHAPTER X.—What we waste in Drink ..... Pages 101-105

CHAPTER XI.—Questions and Answers—Barley—Cider—Outside purchase—Rich and Poor—Maine's 17,800 arrests—Insanity—Search right—Hotels—Taxes—Market—Prohibition Landmarks ..... Pages 106-111

CONCLUSION ..... Pages 112-116

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/canadatemperance00fost

THE

CANADA TEMPERANCE MANUAL

AND

PROHIBITIONIST'S HANDBOOK.

INTRODUCTORY.

In Canada, as in all Anglo-Saxon countries, the advance in temperance sentiment has been very marked and rapid during the last thirty years. This may be readily perceived by a comparison of the individual and social habits of the people of to-day with those of the preceding generation. It will be equally evident, if we inspect the statute provisions for the regulation or suppression of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, and notice their uniform tendency towards increasing stringency. Long before Confederation, the opinion was widespread through the various Provinces, that existing license laws had failed to supply the needed check, and that steps must be taken either to increase their efficiency, or to replace them by prohibitory enactments. In Nova Scotia, the necessary pre-requisite of obtaining the signatures of two-thirds of the ratepayers in the district, before a license could be granted, had had the virtual effect of outlawing the traffic; so that in many of its counties no licenses for the sale of liquor have been granted for ten, fifteen, twenty, and in the case of Yarmouth County, for forty years. In New Brunswick, the popular feeling was exemplified in the enactment of a prohibitory law, in 1855, but which, owing to political complications, was repealed before it had any fair

chance of proving effective. The License Laws thereafter were year by year increased in stringency, and the scope and influence of the traffic gradually diminished. In Ontario and Quebec, the Temperance Act of 1864 gave power to municipalities to refuse license by a vote of the Council or the ratepayers; and, under its provisions, many counties declared for the principle of prohibition by overwhelming majorities. After the Union of the Provinces, in 1867, a strong agitation was commenced for the enactment of a general prohibitory law for the Dominion of Canada, and this agitation bore fruit in 1873-4-5, in the presentation of petitions to the Canadian Parliament, representing a total of more than 500,000 petitioners, praying for the enactment of such a law. In 1874, Parliament authorized the appointment of two commissioners to make a thorough investigation into the working and results of prohibition in various States of the United States, and these brought back, and presented for consideration, a most valuable collection of facts and statistics altogether in favour of prohibitory as compared with license legislation. Reports recommending the enactment of a prohibitory law for the Dominion of Canada were submitted by the Select Committee of the Senate and Commons, and adopted by committees of both Houses.

The question as to jurisdiction was, however, in the way. It was doubtful as to whether the Dominion or the Provincial Legislatures had authority to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors, and this doubt hampered all efforts in the direction of prohibitory legislation in either Local or General Legislatures.

No such doubt, however, existed as to the North West Territories, and, in 1875, the Dominion Parliament passed a law for the whole of that great country and which ran as follows:—

"The sale, manufacture or possession of intoxicating liquors in the North West Territories is prohibited, except with the special written permission of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Territories."

This law has, on the whole, been rigorously carried out and has been productive of the very best effects.

At last, in 1878, the Canada Temperance Act was introduced by the Mackenzie Government, and, after full discussion, was passed on its second reading without a division. This Act, although not all that temperance people wish, nor yet all that the exigencies of the case demand, is yet generally acquiesced in as the best under the present circumstances, and a long stride toward ultimate complete prohibition.

The legality of the Act has been tested in the Courts, and, in April, 1880, was confirmed by the Supreme Court of Canada, with but one judge dissenting. An appeal was immediately taken to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council of Great Britain, the case was very fully argued, and on the 22nd of June, 1882, a judgment was given which definitely and finally settled the question of jurisdiction as to the power of prohibiting the traffic, and fully confirmed the constitutionality of the Canada Temperance Act.

Three attempts have been made in Parliament to impair the efficiency of the Act. In 1880, the Boultbee amendment, which provided that, before the Act can be adopted, it shall receive a majority of the whole number of votes on the Voters' Lists, was carried through the House of Commons, but defeated in the Senate. In 1881, it was again introduced into the Commons, but thrown out by a significant vote of 82 to 54. In 1881, the Almon amendment, which proposed to exempt from the operation of the Act, malts and wines having less than 10 per cent. of alcohol, passed the Senate by a vote of 28 to 26, but was not suffered to come to a vote in the Commons.

In March, 1884, the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia decided that the Act could not come into force in any County wherein licenses had not been running at the time of the adoption of the petition.

To meet this difficulty the Dominion Government was asked to introduce an amendment to provide that the Act in all such Counties shall come into force within thirty days from the date of the proclamation, and the amendment was made retroactive so as to establish the Act in all such Counties which had adopted the Act previous to the passage of the amendment. This became law in April, 1884.

Up to the present time, May 31st, 1884, the Act has been voted upon in three cities and thirty-seven counties of Canada, and has been adopted in two cities and thirty-one counties by an average majority of about two to one.

CHAPTER I.

THE NATURE OF THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

It is a Local-Option Prohibitory measure, and can be applied to any city or county upon a majority vote of the electors. As such it possesses many advantages.

1. *It is "government by the people and for the people."*

A county or city to a large extent administers its own affairs and bears its own expenses. Nothing touches its interests so closely as the traffic in liquors within its borders. This traffic burdens it with pauperism, taxes it for crime, degrades it by dissipation, curses it with idleness and vice, and disturbs, to a greater or less extent, every department of its industry and activity. With regard to such a potent factor it is but fair that the county or city should have the right to either condemn or approve it. If the people think that licensed bars should not be allowed in their midst, and that their families should not be exposed to these ruinous influences, who shall say that, as the ones most nearly interested, they should be deprived of the right of saying so? And on what principle of popular government can it be contended that a small minority of sellers financially interested in the profits of their sale, shall be allowed to force their traffic on a majority whose homes and best interests are exposed to constant risk? The Canadian Legislature recognized this right of a community to protect itself and embodied it in this Act. The principle in itself is sound. It asks nothing more than that the wishes of the majority of legal voters as expressed at the ballot-box shall be respected, and so is free from all charge of fanaticism.

2. *It is non-partisan:*

It takes the whole question out of the range of party politics. The issue is simply "Prohibition" or "License," free from any complications of men or measures. In no other way can so pure and fair an expression of opinion be gained

from the electorate. Any one who has watched the course of Temperance legislation in the United States knows that its greatest bane has been the partyism that has been mingled with it, either in its enactment or its enforcement. The Canada Temperance Act has happily avoided this rock of peril, and in its inception as well as its methods of working is as fully removed from the distractions of party as it possibly can be.

3. *It carries with it a majority sentiment.*

It has the advantage of thorough discussion before the electorate. It is canvassed in all its bearings. The public mind is awakened and the matter is thoroughly considered. A conclusion thus reached and made authoritative at the polls stands the best chance for full and effective enforcement. Those who vote for it will not be likely to permit its violation. The law goes into effect as an expression of the best and newest and strongest thought upon the question in the county or city where it is to be worked.

4. *It meets the question of revenue in the easiest possible manner:*

A General Prohibitory Law would oblige the Finance Minister of the Dominion to make good an immediate yearly deficit of from four to five millions of dollars. This would, to very many minds, be an almost insuperable difficulty, and would certainly decrease the chances of obtaining such a law. But in this the revenue gradually diminishes as constituency after constituency stops the sale and decreases the consumption of alcoholic liquors, and thus gradually adapts itself to the changed conditions. Increased thrift and saving result in increased consumption of dutiable goods, and increased accumulation of wealth and resources. This gradual process, extended over a series of years, will be found to solve the problem of revenue without detriment to the Government and with incalculable improvement to the country.

5. *It best meets the objection as to manufacturing interests:*

A Total Prohibitory Law would render the breweries and distilleries useless and throw large investments of funds back upon the hands of their owners, and the cry of "vested interests" would at once be raised. The present mode of procedure does not directly interfere with these. It gives the people of the municipality a right to say, not whether the product of the brewery and distillery shall be *consumed*, but whether it shall be *sold or not* in their limits; and so merely constrains the manufacturer to find other markets and to measure his production by the volume of demand. It leaves to him the outside market, and gradually diminishes the home demand. And surely if a community comes to the conclusion that it is best for it not to trade in the wares of the manufacturer, it ought to have a right to say so, and the manufacturer must simply take his products where he can find unrestricted sale. In this way the property of the brewer and distiller is not rendered useless to him at once—it is only made a little less profitable each year—and when it becomes profitless he can change it for some other as business men have to do the world over. No Prohibition Act could deal more gently with the makers of liquors.

6. *It is reasonable to the dealers themselves.*

An opportunity is given them in each community to demonstrate the necessity and usefulness of their occupation, and if they can succeed in proving this to the satisfaction of the Electorate they are secured in their traffic. But if they fail to do this, the arbitrament of the people, after a full discussion, ought surely to be allowed, Even then the sellers are given full time to unload their stocks and prepare for the change. In no case can the Act go into operation in less than five months after its adoption, and generally it is a full year or more. No licenses are revoked or annulled. The dealers get all they have paid for under terms of their licenses, and are simply advertised by the community that when their present licenses expire they will

not be renewed, and that no further contracts will be made. It deals wholly with the public sale for beverage purposes—does not forbid or interfere with the rights of individuals to use liquors.

7. *It deals fairly with the community.*

It does not deny the sale of alcohol for necessary purposes: for medicine, for mechanical or chemical purposes, or for sacramental use. No disease shall go without alcohol for a remedy if the physicians deem it requisite. No arts or part of the world's work shall be hampered by being deprived of it. If Christian churches wish to use alcoholic wine at the Communion, they can readily obtain it.

It goes into no person's home and dictates to him what he shall use upon his table. It allows him to buy and use what liquor he wants, and as he wants it. It simply says to him:—"Sir, the public sale of drink in the dramshop is fraught with vast evil to our community, and is full of temptation to drunkenness and crime. If you wish to use liquor you may do so; but in deference to the best interests of the community we ask you to be kind enough to put up with the inconvenience of buying it somewhere outside of our community."

And surely no reasonable man can object to that, when he considers, on the other hand, the ruin of many which must inevitably result, if he is successful in his demand for having public sale in the community and thus retaining the temptation.

8. *It is a constant means of education.*

A General Prohibitory Law would be settled by one campaign, or given without a popular vote by the Legislature. This takes up county by county, city by city, and so keeps the subject constantly before the country. In this continual agitation the best and newest thought comes into play, fresh decisions of intelligent electorates give voice to the popular feeling, and apathy becomes impossible. As a means of education and interest, the Act is a double blessing.

CHAPTER II.

THE PROVISIONS OF THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

"In this Act the expression 'intoxicating liquor' means and comprehends any and every wine, and any and every combination of liquors or drinks *that are intoxicating*."

The Act can be adopted by any city, or county in Canada; and the word county, for the purposes of the Act, "includes every town, township, parish and other division or municipality, except a city, within the territorial limits of the county, and also a union of counties when united for municipal purposes."

The electors for the purposes of the Act are, all persons within the county or city qualified to vote therein at the election of a member of the House of Commons.

In order to bring the Act to a vote, a petition must be signed by at least one-fourth of the legal voters in the municipality, which petition, after having been duly deposited for ten days in the office of the Sheriff or Registrar, is to be forwarded to the Secretary of State for Canada, thereupon the Governor-General in Council examine the petition, and if they approve it, give official notice of a day upon which the electors may vote for or against the petition for the adoption of the Act.

If more than half of all the votes polled are for the petition, the same shall be held to have been adopted, and shall be so returned to the Governor-General in Council.

The Governor-General in Council may then, at any time after the expiration of 60 days from the day on which the petition was adopted, by Order in Council published in the *Canada Gazette*, declare that the Act shall be in force and

take effect in the county or city from and after the day on which the annual or semi-annual licenses for the sale of spirituous liquors, then in force in such county or city, will expire; but such date must be at least 90 days from the date of such Order in Council; if not then the Act is not to come into force until the like day in the then following year.

NOTE.—Suppose, for explanation's sake, the licenses expire on the 1st of May, 1882, and that the Order in Council is proclaimed on the 1st day of February, 1882. The interval between these dates would comprise only 89 days. The Act would not therefore come into force until May 1st, 1883.

By an amendment, passed in 1884, it is enacted that in Counties where no Licenses had been previously granted the Act shall come into force in 30 days from the day of the date of the proclamation.

If in any county or city one half or more of all the votes polled have been against the petition, the petition shall be declared not adopted, and no similar vote can be put to the electors of said county or city for a period of three years *from the day on which such vote was taken.*

If the Act is proclaimed in force, no vote can be taken for its repeal within three years *from the day on which it came into force.*

PROHIBITIONS.

When the Act has been adopted and proclaimed in force, the retail sale of all intoxicating liquors for use as beverages, is at once and entirely stopped; all bars are closed, and no licenses therefor can be issued.

The sale of alcoholic compounds is allowed for three purposes:—medical, sacramental and mechanical; and vendors, not to exceed one in each township, two in each town, or one for each 4000 inhabitants in cities, are appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor, or under the Dominion License Act of 1883, by the Board of License Commissioners for this purpose. The conditions of sale for each of these purposes are very strict and such as to effectually guard against any abuse.

The following parties are allowed to sell by wholesale, but only to the vendors mentioned in the above paragraph,

or to such persons as shall forthwith carry the same beyond the limits of the county or city, or of any adjoining county or city which is under the Act, viz.: manufacturers of cider, licensed distillers or brewers, companies incorporated to carry on the business of cultivating grapes and manufacturing wine therefrom, and persons exclusively engaged in a wholesale trade, and licensed by the county or city to sell liquors by wholesale.

The smallest quantity which can be sold by wholesale is, for beer, eight gallons; for all other liquors, ten gallons. Whenever cider, distilled, or malt liquors are thus sold by those producing them, it must be only at the place of manufacture, and in all the above cases the burden of proof lies with the sellers to furnish satisfactory evidence that the liquors sold were to be carried forthwith outside the limits of the city or county, or of an adjoining city or county under the Act for consumption outside the same.

Manufacturers of pure native wines made from grapes grown by them in Canada, may also sell their wines at the place of making, but only in quantities of not less than ten gallons (except for medical or sacramental purposes when any quantity from one to ten gallons may be sold), and only when duly licensed thereto by the proper authority.

The adoption of the Act therefore entirely prohibits the retail of all intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes within the limits of the city or county under the Act. All bars, shops, tippling places and shebeens are to be closed—temptations are removed; it allows the sale, under strict regulations, for medical, sacramental and mechanical purposes; it limits the wholesale traffic to customers who shall forthwith carry the liquor outside the limits of the city or county, or of an adjoining city or county which may be under the Act.

The single exception is in the case of persons who make pure native wines from grapes grown by themselves in Canada. These can sell *only by wholesale*, and only then if they obtain license therefor from the proper authority.

PENALTIES.

Any person who by himself, his clerk, servant or agent, violates the above provisions of the Act shall be liable on summary conviction : for the first offence, to a penalty of not less than $50 ; for the second offence, to a penalty of not less than $100 ; and for every subsequent offence to imprisonment not exceeding two months.

All intoxicating liquors in respect to which the offence has been committed, and all kegs, barrels, cases, bottles, packages or receptacles in which the same are contained shall be forfeited.

All offences are to be prosecuted as directed by the "*Act respecting the duties of Justices of the Peace out of Sessions in relation to Summary Convictions and Orders*" so far as no other provision is made in the Act itself, and all the provisions contained in the said Act shall be applicable to such prosecutions, and to the Judicial and other officers before whom the same are authorized to be brought.

PROSECUTIONS.

Prosecutions may be brought :

In the Province of Quebec :—Before the Recorder or Judge of the Sessions of the Peace of Montreal or Quebec, for offences committed in these cities ; before a Stipendiary Magistrate or any two Justices of the Peace for the district wherein an offence has been committed, in any other part of the Province ; or before the Sheriff of any district outside of Quebec or Montreal.

In Ontario :—Before any Stipendiary Magistrate, any two Justices of the Peace of the County, City or District where the offence was committed, or before the Police Magistrate or Mayor of any County, City or Town.

In Nova Scotia :—Before a Stipendiary Magistrate or any two Justices of the Peace of the County in which the offence was committed.

In New Brunswick :—Before any Police, Stipendiary or Sitting Magistrate, or Commissioner of a Parish Court, or any two Justices of the Peace in and for the County in which the offence was committed.

In Manitoba:—Before the Police Magistrate or two Justices of the Peace in whose territorial jurisdiction or County the offence was committed.

In British Columbia :—Before any Stipendiary Magistrate or any other two Justices of the Peace for the jurisdiction within whose limits the offence was committed.

In Prince Edward Island :—Before the StipendiaryMagistrate for the city or town, or any other two Justices of the Peace of or for the County in which the offence was committed.

When prosecutions are brought before a Stipendiary, Sitting, or Police Magistrate, Recorder, Judge of Sessions of the Peace, Sheriff, Commissioner or Mayor, no other Justice shall sit or take part.

Prosecutions shall be commenced within three months after the alleged offence, and shall be heard and determined in a summary manner, either upon confession of the defendant, or the evidence of a witness or witnesses.

APPEALS.

No appeal shall be allowed from any conviction, judgment or order when the conviction has been made by a Stipendiary, Sitting, or Police Magistrate, Recorder, Judge of the Sessions of the Peace, Sheriff or Commissioner of Parish Courts.

FACILITATION OF EVIDENCE AS TO OFFENCE.

In describing offences in any proceedings, it shall not be necessary to state the name, kind or price of the liquor, or the person to whom it was sold, or the quantity disposed of.

The presence of a bar, counter, beer-pumps, kegs, or other appliances or preparations similar to those usually

found in places where liquors are accustomed to be sold, in conjunction with distilled or fermented liquors, shall be taken as *prima facie* evidence of illegal sale.

In proving the unlawful disposal of liquors, it shall not be necessary to show that any money actually passed, or any liquor was actually consumed, if the Court is satisfied that a transaction in the nature of a sale or bargain or other unlawful disposal really took place.

A witness is not required to depose to the precise description of liquor sold, or the precise consideration given therefor, or that the sale took place with his participation, or to his own personal knowledge, ; but the Court shall, so soon as it seems evident to it that an infraction of the law has taken place, put the defendant on his defence, and in default of his rebuttal of such evidence, shall commit him accordingly.

The person opposing or defending, or the wife or husband of such person, shall be competent and compellable to give evidence in any proceeding.

A warrant for search may be issued by a Stipendiary, Police, or Sitting Magistrate, Commissioner of Parish Court, Recorder, Judge of the Sessions of the Peace, Sheriff, Mayor, or one of the Justices before whom any prosecution for an offence is brought, when it is proved upon oath by a credible witness, that there is reasonable cause to suspect that the liquor, in respect to which such offence has been committed, is anywhere concealed.

If the person so charged is convicted of the offence, then the liquor which has been brought before the Court by virtue of the search warrant, is to be destroyed up to twenty gallons in quantity,—if over twenty gallons, the excess is to be forfeited, with all receptacles and apparatus found.

In addition to the above, all methods of procedure and evidence as provided for by the "Act respecting the duties of Justices of the Peace out of Sessions in relation to summary convictions and orders" are enacted as specially applicable to this Act.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE ACT.

A prosecution may be brought by any person, or in the name of any person.

A prosecution may be brought by or in the name of the Collector of Inland Revenue, within whose official division the offence was committed.

It shall be the duty of such Collector of Inland Revenue to bring a prosecution whenever he shall have reason to believe that any offence has been committed, and a prosecution therefor can be sustained.

In Ontario the enforcing machinery of the Crooks' Act is applied to the Canada Temperance Act wherever carried. The Board of Commissioners and Inspector of Licenses have all power under the Canada Temperance Act that they possess under the Crooks' Act. As to the Inspectors so appointed under the Canada Temperance Act their duties are defined as follows :—" It shall be the duty of every Inspector of Licenses in each municipality to see that the several provisions of this Act are duly observed, and to proceed by information and otherwise to prosecute for the punishment of any offence against the provisions of this Act, and in case of wilful neglect or default in so doing in any case, such Inspector shall incur a penalty of $10 for each and every such neglect or default."

By Sections 142 and 143 of the Dominion License Act of 1883, Commissioners and Inspectors are appointed in all counties and cities which have adopted the Act, and it is the duty of these to look after its prompt and efficient enforcement. All fines and penalties collected form a fund which is used for enforcing the Act. If the fund so provided be not found sufficient, the deficiency is made up from the Dominion Treasury. The enforcing machinery is therefore of the very best.

CHAPTER III.

HOW THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT HAS BEEN RECEIVED.

It is a reasonable question for us to ask how the people of the various counties and cities of Canada in which the Act has been submitted have received it. If we find the electors, after a full canvas of its merits and demerits, throwing it aside, we may fairly assume either that the public mind is not ready for so advanced a measure, or that the measure itself is considered defective. Let us look at the facts. The Act was first brought to a vote in Fredericton, the capital city of New Brunswick. Great interest was evoked, and the subject was thoroughly discussed in a long and active campaign. Both parties were carefully organized, the city was completely canvassed and all felt that the result would not only test the reasonableness of the measure, but powerfully influence all future contests. When the ballots were counted on the evening of Oct. 31st, 1878, it was found that the number of votes polled had been large, and that the electors had adopted it by a vote of TWO to ONE. Since then it has passed in nine out of fifteen counties in New Brunswick, in the whole Province of Prince Edward Island, in twelve out of the eighteen counties of Nova Scotia, in three counties of Ontario, and two counties in Manitoba. Up to May 31st, 1884, the Act has been submitted in forty cities and counties of Canada and adopted in thirty-three of these.

The following is a statement of constituencies in which elections have been held under the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, showing the number of votes polled in each case :

CONSTITUENCY.	Date of Election.	No. of votes Polled.	
		For	Against
Fredericton, N. B.	31 Octob'r, 1878	403	203
York, N. B.	28 Dec., 1878	1229	214
Prince, P. E. I.	28 Dec., 1878	2062	271
Charlotte, N. B.	14 March, 1879	867	149
Carleton, N. B.	21 April, 1879	1215	69
Albert, N. B.	21 April, 1879	718	114
Charlottetown, P. E. I.	24 April, 1879	827	253
Kings, P. E. I.	29 May, 1879	1076	59
Lambton, Ont.	29 May, 1879	2567	2352
Kings, N. B.	23 June, 1879	798	245
Queens, N. B.	3 July, 1879	500	315
Westmoreland, N. B.	11 Sept., 1879	1082	299
Northumberland, N. B.	2 Sept., 1880	875	673
Megantic, P. Q.	11 Sept., 1879	372	841
Stanstead, P. Q.	21 June, 1880	760	941
Queens, P. E. I.	22 Sept., 1880	1317	99
Marquette, Ma.	27 Sept., 1880	612	195
Digby, N. S.	8 Nov. 1880	944	42
Queens, N. S.	3 Jan'y, 1881	763	85
Sunbury, N. B.	17 Feb'y, 1881	176	41
Shelburne, N .S.	17 March, 1881	807	154
Lisgar, Ma.	7 April, 1881	247	120
Hamilton, Ont.	13 April, 1881	1661	2811
Kings, N. S.	14 April, 1881	1477	108
Halton, Ont.	19 March, 1881	1483	1402
Annapolis, N. S.	19 March, 1881	1111	114
Wentworth, Ont.	22 March, 1881	1611	2202
Colchester, N. S.	13 May, 1881	1418	184
Cape Breton, N. S.	11 August, 1881	739	216
Hants, N. S.	15 Sept., 1881	1028	92
Welland, Ont.	10 Nov. 1881	1610	2378
Lambton, Ont.	29 Nov. 1881	2988	3073
Inverness, N. S.	6 Jan., 1882	960	106
Pictou, N. S.	9 Jan., 1882	1555	453
St. John, N. B.	23 Feb'y, 1882	1074	1074
Fredericton, N. B., (repeal)	26 Oct., 1882	293	252
Cumberland, N. S.	25 Oct., 1883	1560	262
Prince Co., P. E. I., (repeal)	7 March, 1883	2939	1065
Yarmouth, N. S.	5 March, 1883	1300	96
Oxford, Ont.	20 March, 1883	4073	3298

Many other counties in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Manitoba and Ontario are either far advanced with their petitions, or are taking steps towards submitting the Act.

The Canada Temperance Act has been well received.

CAN THE ACT BE ENFORCED?

There are two ways in which one may test this.

1. What are the provisions made in the Act itself for its enforcement?

2. What are the practical results of the working of the Act?

As to the first point it will be seen that the Act has fair and reasonable machinery for its enforcement.

(*a*) The penalties are sufficient—not less than $50 for the first offence, not less than $100 for the second offence, and imprisonment for each subsequent offence.

(*b*) The evidences are made sufficient and easily attainable. The fact that appliances and apparatus are found with liquors is *prima facie* evidence of sale; it is not necessary to prove the kind of liquor sold, nor the passage of money, but to satisfy the court that something in the nature of a transaction or sale has taken place. The person charged is a compellable witness; the processes are summary; no appeal is allowed from the decision of first court except when a charge is brought before two magistrates; any person may prefer a complaint in his own name, or by or in the name of the Collector of Internal Revenue. In Ontario the machinery *for the enforcement of the Crooks Act* is placed behind the Canada Temperance Act, the municipalities are authorized to appropriate sums of money, and appoint special officers to look after the enforcement of the law; and not less than one-third the fines resulting from the punishment of violators of the law, are appropriated to the same purpose.

(*c*) Any Provincial Legislature has the power to appoint officers, inspectors, &c., to look after the law, and to order

its police, constables and sheriffs to attend to its enforcement. Commissioners and Inspectors are appointed under the Dominion License Act, 1883, whose duty it is to see that the provisions of the Act are fully enforced. All the powers of the said Act are placed at the disposal of the prosecutors and courts to aid in the enforcement of the Canada Temperance Act.

(*d*) Canadians are a law-abiding people, the judges are not elected, nor can they be bribed.

As to the second question, evidence is herewith presented from places where the Act has been in force.

THE WORKING OF THE ACT.

FREDERICTON, N. B.

(*Over* 7,000 *inhabitants.*)

The Act went into force in this city, May 1, 1879. It continued in active operation until August 12, 1879, when its efficiency was almost paralyzed by the decision of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick declaring it *ultra vires*. This paralysis continued until April, 1880, when the Supreme Court of Canada affirmed the constitutionality of the Act, and reversed the judgment of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick. Since then the Act has been in continuous operation. Herewith we append testimonies to its working.

(*From the Police Magistrate.*)

JULY 20, 1880.

As Police Magistrate of the City of Fredericton I have much pleasure in being able to certify to the favourable results of the Canada Temperance Act since it came into operation in this city on the 1st of May, 1879, and more especially since the Act was declared by the Supreme Court of the Dominion to be within the constitutional powers of Parliament.

THERE IS NO SUCH THING NOW AS OPEN SALE OF LIQUOR BY RETAIL IN PUBLIC HOUSES OR SALOONS; there is, of course, an occasional case of illegal sale discovered and punished. The CASES OF STREET DRUNKENNESS ARE VERY FEW INDEED AND THE BUSINESS AT THE POLICE OFFICE ARISING OUT OF INTEMPERANCE HAS BEEN REDUCED BY AT LEAST ONE HALF.

I feel safe in saying that in this city the WORKING OF THE ACT HAS BEEN SUCH AS OUGHT TO SATISFY THE REASONABLE EXPECTATIONS OF ALL THE FRIENDS OF TEMPERANCE.

JOHN L. MARSH,
Police Magistrate.

(*From the Auditor-General of N. B.*)

FREDERICTON, 20th July, 1880.

Previous to the law coming into operation, we had twenty-two licensed liquor dealers in the city ; all of them making money. These dealers all put on their shutters on the 1st of May, and these places of business were closed until the fatal 12th of August, and the LAW DURING THIS PERIOD WAS FAIRLY OBSERVED, AND THE MOST MARKED CHANGE FOR THE BETTER IN THE HABITS OF THOSE WHO WERE KNOWN TO DRINK FREELY WAS ACKNOWLEDGED BY EVEN OPPONENTS OF THE LAW. But on the 12th of August, when the judges decided the law unconstitutional, parties began to sell ; MEN WHO HAD BEEN SOBER FOR THREE MONTHS RETURNED TO THEIR OLD HAUNTS AND HABITS ; FAMILIES WHICH HAD BEEN REAPING THE BENEFIT OF THE LAW IN THE SOBRIETY OF FATHERS AND SONS, WERE AGAIN CALLED UPON TO SUFFER. This state of things continued until the Supreme Court of the Dominion reversed the judgment of our Supreme Court. Immediately on this decision being received here, all the liquor shops, taverns and saloons were at once closed, and I don't hesitate to say that THERE HAS BEEN NO OPEN SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUOR IN THIS CITY AT PRESENT. A FEW DAYS AGO, coming from St. John to Fredericton, A LEGAL GENTLEMAN WHO FREQUENTLY comes to the city PROFESSIONALLY, and who is a VERY RESPECTABLE MODERATE DRINKER, said, in conversation with myself and others, that the LAW WAS VERY STRICTLY OBSERVED in Fredericton, FOR HE COULD NOT PROCURE EVEN A GLASS OF ALE.

New Parliament Buildings are being erected in this city ; there are eighty to ninety men at work ; stonecutters, masons, carpenters and teamsters. Work was commenced about the middle of May, and THE CONTRACTOR told me a day or two since that ONLY ONE MAN WAS OBSERVED UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF LIQUOR DURING THE WHOLE TIME. THE OPPONENTS OF THE LAW ACKNOWLEDGE THAT IT IS DOING A GREAT DEAL OF GOOD AND THAT IT IS WELL CARRIED OUT—NUMBERS OF MEN ARE EVERY DAY INDUSTRIOUSLY EMPLOYED WHO, PREVIOUS TO THE PASSING OF THE ACT, WERE NOTORIOUSLY INTEMPERATE, AND WHO COULD NOT RESIST THE TEMPTATION IF THE SALE WAS OPEN. Some of THESE MEN HAVE GRATEFULLY ACKNOWLEDGED THEIR INDEBTEDNESS TO THE LAW FOR THE BENEFIT THEY ARE DERIVING FROM IT. When the Vice-Regal party visited this city in August, 1879, before the judgment of the Supreme Court was given, large numbers came in from the adjacent country, as well as from distant parts of the Province ; THE CITY WAS FULL OF STRANGERS ; THERE WAS NOT A DRUNKEN MAN TO BE SEEN—no quarrelling—no disturbance—all was quiet and orderly. This was noticed and spoken of by a number of gentlemen who were here among the visitors. It would have been the reverse if the rum-shops had been open.

JAMES S. BEEK,
Aud.-Gen. of N. B.

(*From Twenty-nine of the Foremost Citizens of Fredericton.*)

FREDERICTON, N. B., February, 1881.

We, the undersigned citizens of Fredericton, N. B., are glad to be able to affirm that the Canada Temperance Act has worked well and beneficially in our city. Since the doubts as to its validity (which for a time hampered its operations) were removed by the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in April last, the *Law has been as well enforced as any law.*

There are no open drinking shops in the city, and that the illegal or secret sale is watched and punished, is clearly shown by the fact that fines to the amount of many hundred dollars have been collected since April, and some dozen offenders have been lodged in jail.

The right of search has been exercised in but two cases ; both parties were the keepers of beer shops, and were subsequently fined for selling whiskey.

In the enforcement of the Law there has been no interference with the rights of any individual ; nothing has been done of which any good citizen can complain.

Drunken men are rarely seen on the streets, there is a real diminution of c imes that always grow of a liquor traffic, and the temptations to drink, which under the license system met the weak and unwary at every turn, no longer exist. These are facts which conclusively establish the beneficent character of the law. The good done by it is apparent to every unprejudiced observer. Those who favoured its adoption are highly satisfied with its working ; and not a few who thought it a doubtful experiment—some, even, who opposed it—are convinced of its power to check a great evil.

A. F. Randolph, Manager People's Bank of N. B.; Theodore H. Rand, Chief Supt. of Education ; J. Steadman, J. C. C.: Jas. S. Beek, Auditor-General, New Brunswick ; Wesley VanWart, Clerk of the Peace, York County ; Geo. J. Bliss, Clerk House of Assemby ; Chas. H. Lugrin, Barrister ; R. Chesnut & Son, Hardware Merchants ; William Wilson, Barrister and Alderman , Geo. Thompson, Assistant Supt. of Education ; G. W. Babbitt, Cashier Rec.-Gen'l ; John Richards, Clerk Asst. Assembly ; James A. VanWart, Barrister ; A. D. Yerxa, Registrar of Deeds, &c., York County ; E. Evans, Pastor of the Methodist Church and President of the Methodist Conference, N. B.; J. C. Risteen, Manufacturer ; A. J. Mowatt, Minister of St. Paul's Presbyterian Church ; Fred P. Thompson, M.P.P.; G. Goodridge Roberts, Rector, of Fredericton ; G. E. Fenety, Queen's Printer ; Jno. L. Marsh, Police Magistrate ; Geo. F. Atherton, Chairman Police Com.; Jos. McLeod, Pastor of F. B. Church, &c.; Geo. W. Fenwick, Collegiate School; Andrew G. Blair, M. P. P.; Jno. Jas. Fraser. M. P. P., Attorney-Gen'l of N. B.; P. McPeake, Postmaster of Fredericton.

(*From the President of the N. B. Methodist Conference—Certified by the Mayor of Fredericton.*)

FREDERICTON, N. B., Jan. 31st, 1881.

In reply to your query respecting the operation of the Temperance Act in this city, I may say that, on the whole, while objection may be made to

some minor details, the working of the Act has been very satisfactory, more so, in fact, than many of its advocates expected.

Considering the well organized opposition of interested parties, the results achieved have been remarkable. Drunkenness, drunken brawls, robberies, and fires, have been much less frequent than during a corresponding period in any previous year.

Its excellence in the prevention of temptation to former inebriates and youthful portion of the community is very great, and its good influence in this respect, I believe to be incalculable.

I am, dear sir, yours truly,

E. EVANS.

I can safely certify that the Canada Temperance Act has been very beneficial in its influence on Society in this city, particularly so as regards the poorer classes, and I can in the main endorse the remarks of the Rev. Mr. Evans.

G. FRED. FISHER,
Mayor.

Fredericton, Feb. 1st, 1881.

I can fully endorse the remarks made by Rev. Mr. Evans in regard to the satisfactory working of the Canada Temperance Act in Fredericton.

W. WILSON,
Alderman.

February 14th, 1881.

With reference to the Act in Fredericton, since 1880 and up to date, it may be said that on the whole its working has been satisfactory. There has been a succession of appeals on all imaginable points, from the constitutionality of the Act which was not settled until June, 1882, down to the smallest technical quibbles. The Act has, however, triumphed over all obstacles, and no better proof of the estimation in which it is held by the citizens can be given than the fact that after a three years' trial, under a heavy and discouraging burden of difficulties, it received on October 26th, 1882, the hearty endorsation of the people at the polls.

As to the enforcement of the Act and the grasp it possesses it will be sufficient to add the following table of prosecutions, convictions, fines, and imprisonments up to date:—

C. T. ACT PUT IN ACTIVE OPERATION IN APRIL, 1880.

Year.	No. of Prosecutions	No. of Convictions.	Fines paid, not including cost.	No. Imprisoned.
1880.....	46	27	$ 550 00	10
1881.....	56	36	1,000 00	6
1882.....	32	26	1,200 00	4
1883.....	40	28	1,350 00	6
Total.....	174	117	$4,100 00	26

JOHN L. MARSH, P.M.

WOODSTOCK, AND CARLETON CO., N. B.

The Editor of the *Sentinel* writes from Woodstock, N. B., August, 1880 :—

We have had seven prosecutions, two of them escaped, after conviction and imprisonment, on a legal technicality, five were convicted and paid the fines. During the past two weeks not a single case of drunkenness or crime resulting therefrom has been before the police-court. We are satisfied with the Act, and there is not a question but that if the law be fairly enforced it will satisfy the expectations of reasonable temperance men.

(*Letter Endorsed by the Mayor of Woodstock.*)

WOODSTOCK, N. B., Feb. 1st, 1881.

A week ago I received your letter anent the temperance law now in force here. In answer, I have but to say that I regard the Scott Act as a most decided improvement upon any previous legislation we have had. Less liquor is consumed here, and one especial feature is that the temptations to drink are no longer openly presented. Some old drinkers that can be trusted, and a certain class that can use doctors and druggists, may be able to get it slyly ; but wherever there is good ground for suspicion, there is little difficulty in procuring conviction, as several cases here abundantly prove. My opinion is most unqualifiedly in favour of the law.

Yours, etc., etc.,

W. WESLEY COLPITTS,
Methodist Minister.

Having read the within letter, I can fully concur in what has been said as to the operation of the Canada Temperance Act in this county.

R. K. JONES,
Mayor.

WOODSTOCK, N. B., Feb. 22nd, 1880.

DEAR SIR,—In answer to your enquiries, I beg to say that after a careful and candid observation of the working of the Canada Temperance Act in this town, I am decidedly of the opinion that it is the most effective legal instrumentality we have ever had placed within our reach for the suppression of the evils resulting from the sale and indulgence in strong drinks. Here it has closed all the liquor shops, and while not by any means having stopped entirely the illegitimate sale of ardents, it has driven the traffic into such low and disreputable places, that those having any claims to respectability refuse to follow it, and are therefore constrained to be temperate. I believe that, in any community where the people are true to themselves, and to the interests of God and humanity involved, with the Canada Temperance Act in force, rum selling may be reduced to the merest minimum. If there be any failure found, it will not be in the law itself, but in the inefficient methods adopted for its enforcement.

JAMES WATTS,
Editor *Sentinel*.

WOODSTOCK, N. B., Feb. 5th, 1881.

The Canada Temperance Act came in force last spring. Before that time there were several Taverns in the town of Woodstock, and some few in the country, and they were well patronized.

In the town of Woodstock, on Sunday as well as week-days, men were to be seen walking the streets in a state of intoxication ; but since the law came in force there has been no public open sale of liquors, and although several persons have been selling, it has been done—as they would commit any other crime—in secret. Occasionally, now, a drunken man can be seen in the street, but the present condition of things stands in commanding contrast with that of one year ago.

The prospect is, that in this country in a short time the traffic in intoxicating liquors as a beverage will be overcome, even in secret.

Last spring after the law came into operation, the lumbermen came into town with scores of their men, and it was commented on by the citizens, that they never saw the men so quiet and orderly ; for, on former similar occasions, the rum they drank made them the very dread of the town.

It is too soon yet to speak of the effects of the law upon the industries and habits of the town, beyond certain visible effects above described.

Several persons have been fined for violation of the law, and this has given respect and tone to the law and to Temperance work.

May God speed the right in this Dominion of ours.

L. N. SHARP, M. D.

WOODSTOCK, N. B., 10th Feb., 1881.

I am asked to give my opinion as to the working of the "Canada Temperance Act" in this county, which I very cheerfully do.

Although the sale of intoxicating liquor has not been entirely prevented by the adoption of the Act, neither has crime of other kinds entirely ceased, notwithstanding the rigor of the laws against them ; but the large, fashionable, and *would-be respectable* establishments, have abandoned the traffic entirely, and a drink of rum, now, can only be obtained stealthily, and then from the vilest and most miserable of our citizens.

The machinery of the law works smoothly, and with one or two *slight* amendments, it would be perfection itself, so far as permissive temperance goes. I think that our temperance friends are more than satisfied with the efficiency of the act.

I am, truly yours,

STEPHEN B. APPLEBY, Ex-M.P.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

The Act is in force throughout the whole island. It has, however, been much hampered by appeals : first, upon the constitutionality of the Act ; second, upon the question as to whether Summerside was a city or not ; and, thirdly, as to the legality of the vote in Charlottetown. At first the Provincial Government appointed prosecutors under the Act, but these were afterwards taken away, and the burden of prosecution thrown upon private persons. Now that the Dominion License Law has provided for Inspectors, and these have been appointed, the enforcement of the Act is being carefully looked after, and the Traffic is being reduced to a minimum. The estimation in which the Act is held was well shown in the vote for repeal in Prince County, when the majority in favor of the retention of the Act was 1874, out of a total vote of 4004.

The following is a table of convictions, fines, and imprisonments in Charlottetown from August, 1881, to April, 1884 :

	Convictions.	Fines.	Imprisoned
1881	19	$1080	3
1882	13	650	2
1883	7	430	0
1884 (3 months)	17	1000	2

It will be seen that a vigorous prosecution of the Act has been commenced in 1884, and we have every reason to hope that it will be continued, and will result in the destruction of the Liquor Traffic in Charlottetown.

HALTON COUNTY.

The Act was carried in this County on April 19th, 1881, and went into operation in May, 1882. The most determined efforts have been made, both by the opponents of the Act within the County and the liquor power in Ontario, to break down the Act. But the attempt has failed. With

wonderful zeal and sacrifice the friends of temperance have met every attack and surmounted every obstacle. To-day the Act is more firmly established and more fully believed in than at any time since its adoption. We have room for but a few of the many testimonials which might be given as to its efficiency:—

R. Little, Esq., Public School Inspector, whose visits take him to every part of the county, says: "From personal observation, I honestly and conscientiously believe that drinking has *greatly* decreased."

William Kearns, M.P.P., for the county, says: "I would advise the electors in every county in Ontario to adopt the Scott Act. Its adoption in Halton has to a great extent prevented the sale and use of liquor. It has not injured business."

William McCraney, M.P. for the county, says: "The Scott Act works well in Halton. It has not injured business. Drinking has been greatly reduced. The law is well administered and respected."

Johnson Harrison, Esq., Milton, says: "I approve of the Scott Act, because it separates Temperance men from the traffic more thoroughly than any other law we have, and, independent of party, gives all an opportunity to declare their principles, thereby branding the traffic with 'evil and only evil.'"

H. P. Moore, Esq., Editor and Proprietor of the Acton *Free Press* says: "It is a fact, patent to all, that drinking has very largely diminished since the Act came into force here. Since the 1st of May, 1882 (nearly two years), I have seen but two men under the influence of liquor in Acton, and they came from Rockwood, in Wellington County, and I occupy as good a point for observation as any one. I have it upon official authority that not a single shipment of liquor has been received at Acton station from the firm of Gooderham & Worts, Toronto, during the past year. There is not the slightest suspicion that liquor is sold any place in Acton outside the hotels and drug stores."

N. Lindsay, Esq., Reeve of the Municipality of Esquesing, writes: "The Canada Temperance Act has done all that the most sanguine among us expected. Any person with the least observation can readily see the marked difference between the number of intoxicated persons who used formerly to be seen about the streets of our villages, and the number now to be met with in that condition. The principal benefit in my estimation is the fact that temptation is removed from the young. Whatever drinking is done has to be done secretly, where none but those who can be trusted to keep silence are present. As regards the business cry I find that those business men who are opposed to temperance principles in general, are the only ones who say that business has been injured by it."

G. H. Kennedy, Georgetown, writes: "I have no hesitation in saying the Act has fully met my expectation in this county, and is being very well enforced. Notwithstanding the continued efforts of the liquor interests the Act is gaining favor in this county and would not be repealed."

The following declaration, signed by upwards of one hundred of the leading men of the county, shows that the Act is anything but a failure in Halton:

We, the undersigned, certify that business has not been injured by the Scott Act—that the amount of drinking has been greatly reduced. We believe the Act would be sustained if a repeal vote were taken ; and we would recommend the electors of Oxford County to pass the Act :

D. L. Brethour.
John Wales.
W. H. Lindsay.
J. Hollinrake.
T. J. Starret.
E. Dickson.
M. Garbutt.
Wm. Bews.
R. Pearson.
L. Lowe.
M. Clements, Sheriff.
Wm. Smiley.
John Ruddy.
A. E. Cummer.
A. Willmott.
H. C. Foster.
C. Cookman.
Wm. Armstrong.
J. S. Hatton.
John Laking.
E. L. Liddycoat.
D. D. Reid.
J. Donaldson.
M. Crawford.
J. W. Easterbrook.
J. H. Harrison.
G. Irving.
W. A. Shields.
D. M. Harrison.
D. A. Vanfleet.
J. Worthington.
Wm. C. Thompson.
Wm. Cromwell.
D. Liddle.
Alex. Robinson.
James Erwin,
Peter Chisholm.
James Reid.
Neil McMillan.
James Moore.
J. A. Speight.
D. Henderson.
W. P. Brown.
James Matthews,
J. C. Hill.
John Cameron.
J. Harrison.
James Harrison.
P. McTaggart.
H. Hollinrake.
Thomas Henderson.
J. Bastedo.
G. A. Hemstreet.
S. Dice.
G. McNair.
J. Ezard.
John Colling.
A. Dickson.
Wm. Van Allan, Gaoler.
H. Campbell.
S. Centre.
J. Tock.
Wm. Sloan, jr.
A. C. McMillan.
D. McKay.
James Menzies, Reeve.
S. R. Lister.
C. E. Ravin.
G. Currie.
D. Wheelihan, Deputy Reeve.
R. S. Porter.
W. Shingler.
J. Hartley.
J. H. Shelds.
E. T. Earl.
E. G. Page.
C. R. Vanfleet.
Robert Simpson.
D. Harris.
John Zimmerman,
A. Picket.
Wm. Player,
R. Irving.
Alex. McPhedran,
H. P. Moore.
J. Fyfe.
R. E. Nelson.
A. E. Matthews.
W. H. Howell.
Thomas T. Moore.
John Stephenson.
C. C. Speight."

Surely no reasonable man could ask for more convincing testimonies as to the possibilities of enforcing the Act, or the undoubted benefits that accrue from it.

CHAPTER IV.

PROHIBITION IN MAINE.

It seems really strange that people should be found who will reiterate the statement that Prohibition has not succeeded in Maine. In almost every instance they will be found to be persons who either are determined to believe all prohibitory laws a failure, or are entirely unread as to the history and results of the Maine Law, or who set up the preposterous plea that the law fails if in a single instance or in a number of instances it can be proven that its provisions are violated. First, then, it becomes necessary to fix a standard of success. What shall it be? Are we to believe that every law is a failure which does not *entirely suppress and eradicate* the evil against which it is directed? Suppose we judge other laws by that standard, what one of them should we find a success? People steal and our jails contain burglars, breakers, robbers and petty thieves,—is therefore the law against theft a failure? People gamble, engage in lotteries, run places of vice, sell diseased meat, violate health ordinances, &c., but no one thinks of declaring that therefore we are to conclude that the laws which prohibit these things are failures and ought to be repealed.

Evidently we cannot set up as a standard by which to judge the efficacy of an enactment,—*the total suppression of the evil against which the enactment was directed.*

But if a law tends to make it more difficult and hazardous to do certain wrong things, takes away the respectability which would otherwise attach to the wrong doers, removes facilities and temptations for the wrong doing, and gradually so acts upon the public conscience as to make it revolt more and more at the thought of the wrong doing, such law has been and is a success.

Thus the enactment against gambling is successful and to be maintained, because it makes the operation more difficult and risky, takes away the respectability which would attach to it if it were either supported or allowed by law, removes temptation and facilities for gambling from the young and old, and so influences the general conscience that the public mind grows stronger and stronger in its condemnation of the evil.

With this standard kept in view, let us briefly take up the case of Maine.

The verdict of the people of Maine proclaims the law a success. Surely we may allow the people of Maine to be the best judges of their own law. They have lived under its operations, have seen its results, and measured its influence; they ought to be able to pass a fair judgment upon it.

The Prohibitory Law was enacted in Maine in 1851.

The machinery for the enforcement of the law was gradually set to work and improved as experience suggested. About 1855 its enforcement became general, and the effect upon the dram shops was very marked. The enemies of the law felt the pinch and made an issue in the elections of 1855, repealed the law, and in 1856 enacted a license law in it place. Two years of "stringent license" succeeded, and its demoralizing tendency was so marked that the people elected a legislature that repealed license and re-enacted the Prohibitory Law in 1858. This was like beginning anew. Again it took a little time to get the machinery of the law into working order. Just at this period the WAR BROKE OUT, and from 1860 to 1865 *there was practically little done with the prohibitory law.*

The close of the war brought with it numbers of camp followers and many soldiers who had become utterly demoralized in the terrible campaign in the South.

In 1866 movements were inaugurated for the general enforcement of the law, and in 1867 the influence of prohibition again began to be felt. Year by year this influence has

increased as defects have been remedied and amendments made to the law.

No difficulty has been experienced in the enforcement of the law outside the cities of Portland and Bangor, and in these the difficulty has largely been due to that admixture of "politics and law," which is peculiar to American institutions. Even in these cities the evidence in behalf of the law is overwhelming, whilst in the rest of Maine its effects have been most marked and salutary.

The people have thus had from 1866 to the present an experience of the law—in that time they have tested it. The people believe in it. No political party in Maine dares put a license as a plank in its platform In 1879 on a test vote as to the exclusion of cider, native wines, &c., from the operation of the law, the legislature affirmed the law *in its entirety* by the significant vote of 129 to 17.

In February, 1881, a determined effort was made to induce the legislature to modify the law in favour of malts. The committee to whom the subject was referred did not think it worth while to *report a resolution to the House in favour of it.*

Personal testimonies as to the efficiency of the law can be quoted by the hundreds, and of the most undoubted authority. We append a few:

We say without reserve, that if liquors are sold at all, it is in very small quantities compared with the old time, and in a secret way as all other unlawful things are done.

JOSHUA L. CHAMBERLIN,
Governor from 1867 to 1871.

Probably not one-tenth as much sold as formerly. In some places liquor is sold secretly in violation of the law, as many other offences are committed against the statutes, but in large districts of the State, the Liquor Traffic is nearly or quite unknown, where formerly it was carried on like any other trade.

GOVERNOR PERKHAM, 1872.

In more than three-fourths of the State, particularly in the rural sections, open rumshops are almost unknown, and secret sales comparatively rare.

GOVERNOR DINGLEY, 1874.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the Prohibitory Law has been very generally enforced ; especially in the cities and large towns where the traffic is most persistently attempted to be carried on in defiance of it. The law, as a whole, fairly represents the sentiment of the people.

GOVERNOR CONNOR, 1876.

I can and do, from my own personal observation, unhesitatingly affirm that the consumption of intoxicating liquors in Maine, is not to-day one-fourth as great as it was twenty years ago ; that in the country portions of the State, the sale and use have almost entirely ceased ; that the law itself, under a vigorous enforcement of its provisions, has created a temperance sentiment which is marvellous, and to which opposition is powerless.

HON. WM. P. FRYE, M. C. of Maine.

And concurred in by

HON. LOT M. MORRILL,
HON. JAMES G. BLAINE,
HON. H. HAMLIN,
} Of U. S. Senate.
HON. JOHN LYNCH, M.C. for Maine.

PORTLAND, May 28, 1872.

As the result of the adoption of Prohibition, we have to say that the traffic has fallen off very largely ; in relation to that there can not possibly be any doubt. Many persons with the best means of judging, believe that the liquor trade now is not one-tenth as large as formerly. We do not know but such an opinion is correct, but we content ourselves with saying that the diminution of the trade is very great, and the favourable effects of the policy of Prohibition are manifest to the most casual observer.

BENJ. KINGSBURY, JR., Mayor.
W. M. THOMAS, Ex-Mayor.
AUG. E. STEVENS, "
J. T. MCCOBB, "
JACOB MCLELLAN, "

AUGUSTA, 1872.

If we were to say the quantity of liquors sold here is not one-tenth as large a formerly, we think it would be within the truth ; and the favourable effect of the change upon all the interests of the State is plainly seen everywhere.

J. T. EVELETH, Mayor.
JOSHUA NYE, State Constable.
G. G. STACY, Secretary of State.
B. B. MURRAY, Adjutant General.

We are sure that the Liquor Trade is greatly diminished.

JOSEPH HOWARD, Ex-Mayor.
D. W. FESSENDEN, Clerk of Cumberland C. C.
EBEN PERRY, Sheriff.
W. E. MORRIS, Judge of Municipality.
WM. SENTER, Ex-Alderman.

DOVER, N. H., May 31, 1872.

In the course of my duty I have become thoroughly acquainted with the state and extent of the liquor traffic in Maine, and I have no hesitation in saying that the beer trade is not more than one per cent. of what I remember it to have been, and the trade in distilled liquors is not more than ten per cent. of what it was formerly. Where liquor is sold at all it is done secretly, through fear of the law.

WALCOTT HAMLIN,
Supervisor of In. Rev. Dist. of Maine, N.H. and Vt.

(*From His Excellency the Governor of Maine.*)

That policy was adopted here in 1851, and now there is no organized opposition to it in the State. After an experience of its results during more than a quarter of a century it is acquiesced in by both political parties as beneficial to the people. The quantity of liquors smuggled into the State and sold surreptitiously is vastly less than was consumed in former years, and the law is executed easily and as well as any other of our criminal laws. I do not think the people of Maine would for any consideration go back to the old policy of license.

SELDEN CONNOR, Governor of the State of Maine.
Augusta, Maine, April 24th, 1878.

(*From all the Senators and Representatives of Maine, in Congress.*)

House of Representatives, Washington, April, 1878.

For the first ten years of its existence there were many difficulties and serious obstacles. A great variety of questions of practice, evidence, and pleading was presented to the courts of law for adjudication, and very frequently jurors, overcome by their prejudices, failed to agree upon verdicts; but the courts finally determined all points of law raised, or that could be, and public opinion reformed all perverse jurors; so that, during the last fifteen years, the enforcement of the provisions of the law has been constant, general, and successful. The result has been that the traffic in intoxicating liquors, a crime by statute, has become a crime in the opinion of a large majority of our citizens, the buyer as well as the seller being regarded as a moral participant in the crime; the use of liquors as a beverage is unpopular, and the sale of it is very limited. In a majority of the

towns in the State none can be obtained except as provided for by law. The propriety of the law having been early made a political issue, one of our great parties has until within two or three years been hostile to it, and evidenced its hostility on its platform. Last year, at its State Convention, when the usual resolution against Prohibition was offered for consideration, it was voted down by a good majority with considerable enthusiasm. The law is now as easily and as thoroughly enforced as that for the prevention and punishment of any other and similar crimes, and we can sincerely affirm that it is a success.—Respectfully,

WILLIAM P. FRYE, S. D. LINDSEY,
EUGENE HALE, LLEWELLYN POWERS,
T. B. REED,
H. HAMLIN,
J. G. BLAINE.

Senate Chamber, May 25th, 1878.

(*From the Sheriff of Cumberland County, Maine.*)

The effect of the law and its prompt execution has been to reduce the liquor traffic to a low point, so that it is carried on only with great secrecy, on a small scale, mostly if not entirely by a low class of our foreign population. This law is firmly supported by public opinion in this State, by which Prohibition is regarded as the most suitable and the proper method of dealing with the liquor traffic—that most fruitful source of misery and wretchedness to the community. Still, the liquor traffic lingers among us, confined almost entirely to our cities and a few of the larger towns of the State, where, under the cover of night in the secret haunts of vice, to be found in all large cities composed of a mixed population, it inspires to deeds of evil and leads to misery and death.

The quantity of intoxicating liquors now sold in Maine is but a small fraction of what was formerly sold freely throughout the State before the enactment of the Maine Law of Prohibition, notwithstanding the many false reports to the contrary circulated abroad by those who are opposed to the principle of Prohibition (as applied to the suppression of the liquor traffic) which has become the settled policy of the State. The friends of Temperance in Maine have reason to take courage and move on, from the fact that in proportion as the rum traffic is driven out from among us public sentiment among our people is steadily advancing in the right direction.

Respectfully yours,
WM. H. DRESSER,
Sheriff of Cumberland County, Maine.

April 15th, 1878.

(*From the City Marshal, Portland.*)

CITY MARSHAL'S OFFICE, PORTLAND, April, 1878.

DEAR SIR,—In answer to your enquiry as to the operation and effect of the Maine Law in this city, I have to say that its execution is as easy as any other of our criminal laws. Liquors intended for unlawful sale are

seized anywhere and everywhere on sight by the officers, with not the slightest resistance or objection from anybody. Juries convict persons on trial for liquor selling, on proper testimony, as readily and promptly as for stealing or cheating or any other crime. The law works with as little friction as any other on our statute books, and the more vigorously it is enforced the more satisfaction in it is expressed by the people. The drinkshops are all secret, and are on a very small scale, and the quantity of liquor sold here is very small compared with the quantity sold openly, freely, and everywhere, wholesale and retail, before the enactment of the law.

Respectfully yours,

C. N. Bridges, City Marshal.

As to the enforcement of the law, the following, taken from the report of the Attorney-General for 1874, may be deemed satisfactory:

Aroostook County—There is less drunkenness and unlawful sale than a year ago.

Cumberland—(Portland is in this county). I have met with no difficulty in prosecuting persons indicted for violations of the liquor law which does not attend the successful prosecution of other criminal offences.

Hancock—There is hardly a town where public sentiment gives it any countenance; in no place is liquor sold openly.

Knox—In farming towns there are practically no violations of the law.

Lincoln—Several attempts have been made to open rum-shops, but they have in every instance been "nipped in the bud."

Penobscot—Efforts during the past year have been crowned with a fair degree of success.

Androscoggin—(Lewiston with a population of 15,000, is in this county). Ever since the enactment of the liquor law, the faithful manner in which the same has been executed has rendered the County of Androscoggin not only an expensive field for the rum-seller to ply his trade in, but a dangerous one so far as the personal liberty is concerned. There is not an open bar for the sale of intoxicating liquors in operation. It is not, as has been declared, an impossibility effectually to suppress drinking houses and tippling shops. The newspapers in this county advocate in the strongest terms the importance of enforcing the liquor law.

Kennebec—One-third more succcessful prosecutions than during any similar period since 1866.

Piscataquis—I find no special difficulty in enforcing the law.

Sagadahoc—The law has been successfully administered in the county.

York—During the present year, signalized as it has been by prolonged effort to suppress the traffic by force of law, crowned as this effort has been by success much exceeding our most sanguine expectations, the people of this county have marked the contrast between free rum and total prohibition. The absence of petty crime, the peace and good order of the community are most marked. In the city of Biddeford, a manufacturing

place of 11,000 inhabitants, for a month at a time, not a single arrest for drunkenness or disturbance has been made, or become necessary. In the city of Saco, it is doubtful if a single place can be found where intoxicating liquor is sold.

If anything additional is needed to add to the force of the above testimony, it is abundantly provided in the late investigation begun and carried on by the Toronto *Globe* in March and April, 1881. The *Globe* sees, as who does not, that the question of prohibition has to be met by the people of Canada, and is one among the few who think that a substratum of facts is necessary in order to deal with the subject honestly and fairly. So the Toronto *Globe* commissioned two of its most trustworthy men to make an investigation into the results of the Maine Law in that State. This they did with commendable fairness and thoroughness. They visited cities, towns, and rural districts, interviewed prominent and experienced men, made their own unassisted explorations, and gave their results in a series of twenty-one letters in the *Globe*. One of these Commissioners was a Prohibitionist in principle, the other an Anti-Prohibitionist; neither were total abstainers. The following is their summing up after two weeks sojourn in Maine:

(*The Anti-Prohibitionist Commissioner's Conclusions.*)

SUMMING UP THE RESULT IN MAINE.

Our work in Maine is now finished, and before commencing inquiries in other States, it may be well to sum up my conclusions while the impressions left by our two weeks' sojourn are yet fresh and distinct. I realize perfectly well that the results at which I have arrived will not be apt to please either party. I do not write with the object of doing so, but simply to tell the plain truth, as arrived at from personal observation, interviews with those whose opinions were likely to be of value, and consideration of the question in all its bearing. I shall not attempt a review or recapitulation of details, but present my conclusions in the form of a series of brief propositions as follows:—

That in the cities the law has been a partial failure so far as uprooting the traffic or even the suppression of open bars is concerned.

That this failure has been greatly exaggerated by quoting exceptional places or periods as typical of the whole State, and by the ingenious perversion of statistics.

That nevertheless, even when laxly administered, the law has decreased the volume of drinking, and done much to make the practice unpopular and disreputable.

That by the admissions of both parties, it has driven all respectable men out of the traffic.

That the facilities for drinking are not presented in such a form or under such surrounding, as to tempt those who have not acquired the drinking habit to do so.

That in the rural portions of the State, the Maine Law has suppressed open drinking and reduced secret drinking to a minimum, and may therefore be considered as effective as any other measure on the statute book.

That the general prosperity, good order, and comfort observable both in city and country, despite the comparatively scanty resources of the State, plainly indicate that the abstinence of the people, whether voluntary or compulsory, has conduced greatly to their welfare.

That while these good results are largely attributable to the widespread reformation in the habits of the people on moral and economical grounds, prohibition has done much to assist this reform and educate public sentiment.

That after thirty years' experience, the public opinion of the State is so strongly in favour of the law that no political party is willing to risk its future by advocating a reversion to license, and that on the contrary the Legislature is continually strengthening the law by more stringent amendments.

That the best elements of society, the old residents, the prominent citizens, and the farming community, are pronouncedly in its favour; and that even many who opposed some of its features would oppose its abrogation still more strongly.

That the class of liquor-sellers who defy the law, are the same class of men who, under a license system, would sell liquor without license.

That the law has at times been made a political machine in the interest of the Republicans, and has led to corrupt bargains between liquor-sellers and politicians, whereby the latter have stepped in to frustrate its operation.

That too much has been claimed for prohibition, which of itself will not remove poverty, want, and degradation, which are frequently brought about by other causes than rum.

That Maine being a community where the cities are small, the population sparsely settled, and the foreign element not large, offers an exceptionally favourable field for the legal suppression of the drink traffic, so that its measure of success in that State does not necessarily imply that it would be equally effective elsewhere, under altogether different conditions.

(*The Prohibitionist Commissioner's Conclusions.*)

THE TEMPERANCE QUESTION IN MAINE.

We are now done with Maine, so far as our enquiries into the workings of prohibition are concerned, and while I am comparatively in the dark as to what effect the facts we have gleaned may have had upon the mind of my anti-temperance colleague, I must confess that I have been greatly sur-

prised at the state of things I have found existing here. I left Toronto a firm believer in the possibility of making legislative prohibition an important factor in a great temperance reform, but at that time, after all I had heard about the state of affairs in Maine, I fully expected to find the evils arising from a very partial and perfunctory enforcement of the Maine Law nearly or quite outweighing any good that may grow out of the moral support given to temperance, by an enactment which, though almost a dead letter, still found a place upon the statute book. To say that I have been greatly surprised at the condition of things I have found here, very faintly expresses it. I have noticed in my letters as I have gone along most of the features that have particularly attracted my attention, as points telling in favour of the Maine Law, but I may be pardoned for repeating a very few of these in the order in which they were met.

In entering the State by the Grand Trunk Railway, I was struck with the evidences of thrift and prosperity in the agricultural districts, though the land seemed for the most part to be naturally very light and unproductive. And this same aspect of the case was powerfully impressed upon me, wherever I journeyed through the rural districts of the State, whether by rail or private conveyance.

At Portland I was astonished—after all I had heard about the disregard for the law—to learn that, though there was liquor to be had, the trade had been driven into such holes and corners, that there was no open or attractive display to tempt reformed drunkards or inexperienced boys. I was also surprised that during my whole stay there, which was more than a week, I only saw one drunken man, and he was of a type that one is usually surprised to see sober.

Even in Bangor I did not find drinking nearly so prevalent as it had been represented to be, though the state of affairs in that citty appeared to be much worse than anywhere else in the State. In Bangor drinking appears to be unfashionable and disreputable.

At Augusta, we found in Governor Plaisted, not only a staunch supporter of the Maine Law, but one of its most able and eloquent advocates ; and yet whisky orators, outside of Maine, triumphantly count Governor Plaisted as one of those who bear testimony to the utter failure of prohibition in Maine.

At Lewiston and Auburn, I found the state of things I have just described, and which I think shows clearly enough that prohibition, if backed up with a sound and healthy state of public opinion, can be successfuly enforced, even in crowded cities.

Wherever we have been I have found a very remarkable unanimity of opinion on the temperance question. With the exception of ex-Mayor Brown, of Bangor, I have not met a single Maine man (outside the liquor trade of course) who has expressed himself as adverse to the Maine Law, or who would wish to see it repealed.

If the Maine Law is in any way damaging the business interests of the State (and it has been alleged it is), it seems very strange that the business men of the State are not aware of the fact. As a rule people do not set the average Yankee down as a fool in business matters, and he is not apt

to be a fanatic on any subject, and yet I find that, after a thirty years' trial, the Maine Law is much better enforced, and vastly stronger in the affections of the people of the State than it ever was before. Only last year some of the friends of the Maine Law challenged its enemies to allow the whole question to be again put before the people to be decided at the polls, but the friends of the free rum all voted against having the question re-submitted. If after so long a trial of prohibition the people of Maine are so overwhelmingly against a return to the license system, can any sane man honestly say that prohibition has proved a failure here? It is not only not a failure, but it is a brilliant success, and I have no hesitancy in pronouncing it the main spring of a great social, moral, and economic reform that has done more for the State than the combined strength of all other forces that have been operating in her favour at any time during the last thirty years.

It may be added that now after thirty years' experience of Statutory Prohibition Maine is to vote upon an amendment engrafting the principle of Prohibition forever upon the constitution of the State. The Legislature has already passed it by an overwhelming majority, and the people will vote upon it in September, 1884. There is no doubt but that it will carry.

CHAPTER V.

PROHIBITION IN MASSACHUSETTS.

The Prohibitory Law was enacted in Massachusetts in 1852, but owing to some of its provisions having been declared unconstitutional in 1854, the legislature of 1855 thoroughly revised and re-enacted the law which stood thereafter the sharpest legal criticism. The law was more or less strictly enforced in the smaller towns and rural districts of the State, but in Boston, especially, and some of the larger cities was but indifferently executed owing to the apathy or liquor sympathies of the authorities. So in 1865, an Independent State Police was created, whose duty it was to "suppress liquor shops, gambling places, and houses of ill-fame." Under the operations of this state police, the law became more rigidly enforced, and reached its maximum of efficiency in the year 1867, during which the state police alone caused 5,331 liquor prosecutions, 1,979 seizures, aggregating 92,658 gallons of intoxicants, and the payments in fines and of costs of $226,427. The year 1867 is thus the red-letter year of prohibition in Massachusetts. Let us read some of the testimonies as to its results. The Constable of the commonwealth, in his report of that year, said:

"Up to the 6th of November (1867) *there was not an open bar known in the entire State, and the open* retail liquor traffic had almost entirely ceased. The traffic, as such, had generally secluded itself to such an extent that it was no longer a public, open offence, and no longer an inviting temptation to the passer by."

Rev. Dr. James B. Dunn, an eminent Presbyterian clergyman said:

"During the year 1867 we made several thorough examinations of Boston to see how the law worked. In North street we counted 56 closed stores, with the significant words 'To Let' on the shutters, while in the other places where liquor had formerly been sold, honest and lawful businesses were carried on. In those dark and narrow streets of the

'North End,' once crowded with throngs of thieves, harlots and the most degraded wretches—where dram shops, dancing saloons, and houses of prostitution pushed their nefarious trade—now quietness and sobriety reigned. In one night during the month of May we visited, between the hours of nine and twelve many of the liquor, dancing, and gambling saloons on Brattle, North, Commercial, Hanover, Union, Portland, Sudbury, Court, Howard, Fleet, Clarke, and Friend streets, and in no place was there to be seen, nor could there be openly bought, one glass of intoxicating drink.

"On another occasion we visited in the evening the principal hotels, such as Parker's, Tremont's, American, and Young's, and found there the same state of things to exist—bar-rooms empty; some of them closed; and where they were open, this significant notice was hung up, 'No liquor sold over this bar.'"

Major Boynton, Chief of State Police, says:—

"The law has entirely surpressed the sale in one half of the towns, in Essex County, notably so."

Major Jones, ex-Chief of State Police, says:—

"The effect of the law has been to change the entire character of the liquor traffic, and confine the traffic to the lowest class, and the absence of the open sale has reduced drinking and crime. There are about 360 towns, and in 300 of them the law is well enforced, and it exercises an influence upon the others."

General B. Butler, U.S. Senator, states:—

"The law is as well enforced as the laws against larceny, except in a very few places, and the effect has been to do away with the attraction and temptation."

Judge Borden, of New Bedford, gives this testimony:—

"For several years the law has been enforced most thoroughly, and in those years there have been less cases of drunkenness, assaults, and the class of crime usually attributed to drink. The law is certainly a success. The enforcement of the law reduces the sales very materially and drives it into the lowest quarters, thus removing the temptation from the young, and this is one of the best features."

Messrs. Oliver & Sons, of North Easton, Mass., say:—

"We have over four hundred men in our works here. We find that on comparing our production in May and June of this year [1868], with that of the corresponding months of last year [1867], that in 1867 with three hundred and seventy-five men, we produced eight per cent. more goods than we did in the same months in 1868 with four hundred men. We attribute this falling off entirely to the repeal of the Prohibitory Law, and the great increase in the use of intoxicating liquors among our men in consequence."

Mr. H. Wilson, woollen manufacturer, Southboro,' Worcester county, Mass., says :—

"During 1868, the year the License Law was in force, our cost of production was nearly ten per cent. more. I employed one hundred and fifty men, and the drinking by some of them interfered with all, and diminished production, but not cost."

Rev. P. Davis, City Missionary of Boston, says :—

"When I commenced my labour six years ago, there were one hundred and thirty-two rum shops in North Street, but when the Prohibitory Law was enforced, all these were closed except two, which were hotels. Since the repeal of the Prohibitory Law I counted one hundred and sixteen in North street, with all their usual accompaniments—gambling and houses of ill-fame."

J. Wilder May, District Attorney for Suffolk County, says :—

"The law is enforced generally, throughout the State in country towns and with good effect; it would be difficult to procure a glass of rum in many of the towns. The shutting up the open bar is certainly productive of a great reduction in drinking."

Governor Washburn, in his inaugural address in 1872, thus speaks of the Prohibitory Law of 1867 :—

"I have no hesitation in saying that, in my judgement, the Prohibitory Law, repealed four years ago, was the best and most effective we have ever had for the suppression of the Liquor traffic. I would like to see it restored in all its power and integrity to our statute books, and rigidly enforced over every foot of soil in the commonwealth. Let this be done, and crime and pauperism will be reduced 50 per cent; a great burden of taxation would be removed from all citizens; a new impetus would be given to every branch of legitimate industry; a heavy weight would be lifted from the hearts and hands of our laboring people, and a most important step taken towards their elevation and improvement."

LICENSE IN 1868.

The strict enforcement of the Prohibitory Law in 1867 united and brought out all the force of the Liquor party, and in the Autumn Elections of 1867, they carried the elections in favour of License. In the Session of 1868, the Prohibitory Law was repealed, and a stringent License Law substituted, which went into force July 1st. Let us now collate some of the evidences as to its results.

The Secretary of the Board of State Charities thus speaks of the effect:

"The result at once began to exhibit itself in our jails and houses of correction; and, as usual, now begins to make its record directly and indirectly on the registers of our various state pauper estrblishments, lunatic hospitals, and reformatories. . . . . .

"But to the poor, and the wives and children of the poor, it makes a wide difference whether we take our departure from the point of prohibition or from that of license. In the latter case, as has been seen the past year, the current sets in favour of more selling and more drinking; and this means, to the poor labouring man or woman, and to children growing up amid bad influences, more poison of the blood, more delirium of the brain, more idleness, more waste, more theft, more debauchery, more disease, more insanity, more assault, more rape, more murder, more of everything that is low and devilish, less of everything that is pure and heavenly."

The Board of State Charities 5th Report, page 35, says;

"The License Law of 1868 was enacted through the influence of those who, (without regard to the consequences of their action to the poor and weak) wished to drink more, and those who hoped to sell more. And it is undoubtedly the case that more is actually drunk and sold."

Governor Claflin, in his message to the Legislature in 1869, says:

"The increase of drunkenness and crime during the last six months, as compared with the same period of 1867, is very marked and decisive as to the operation of the law. The State prisons, jails, and houses of correction are being rapidly filled and will soon require enlarged accommodation if the commitments continue to increase as they have since the present law went into force."

The Chaplain of the State's Prison, in 1868 thus wrote:

"The prison never has been so full as at the present time. If the rapidly increasing flow of intemperance, so greatly swollen by the present wretched license law is suffered to rush unchecked, there will be a fearful increase of crime, and the State must soon extend the limits of the prison or erect another."

The Report of the Inspectors of Massachusetts State Prison, 1868, says:

"The hope expressed in the last report that the average number here would continue to decrease as during the year previous has been disappointed, and the commitments during the year have been 180 to 128 the year before. But this was written before the breaking down of the barriers against the sale of intoxicating drinks, and it is to this cause that the prison authorities ascribe the increase of their convictions—a conclusion which the registers of this Bureau would seem to confirm."

The Report of the Chief Constable, 1869, says:

"The rapid increase of crime and violence during the past year over former years is without precedent in the history of criminal experience. The State Prison and Houses of Correction never held within their limits such numbers as at the present time, whilst the wheels of business are almost clogged with the trial of constantly accumulating criminal business."

Is it unfair to suggest, that the open bar and inviting sale of intoxicating liquors, licensed and unlicensed in every street, is to a considerable extent chargeable and responsible for this state of things?

The Report of the State Board of Charities, 1868, says:

During the past year, it appears that while crime, in general, has increased about ten per cent., drunkenness has increased twice as much, about twenty-four per cent. This fact appears the best possible comment upon the condition of the public mind, and of the legal repression of Intemperance since the State Election of 1868.

The Report of the Chief Constable, 1869, says:—

The license Law has, in no way known to us, contributed in the least degree to the peace and prosperity of the Commonwealth, and in most particulars its effects and results have disappointed its most sincere, reasonable and responsible friends and former advocates.

SHOWING OF CRIME.

Let us now compare the Criminal Statistics of the State of Massachusetts for 1867 and 1868, and see if they bear out the cry of the failure of Prohibition.

The Inspectors of State Prisons for 1868, say:—We simply call attention to the fact of the increased commitments made during eight months of the present year, when the sale of liquor has been almost wholly unrestrained, over those of the same time in the previous year when the sale was prohibited, and to a great extent stopped:—

Commitments in 1867, (Prohibition.)	
February	15
March	13
April	4
May	12
June	7
July	6
August	3
September	5
	65

Commitments in 1868, (License.)	
February	30
March	19
April	16
May	17
June	15
July	17
August	11
September	11
	136

The official report of the Chief of the Boston Police shows the following results, for a period of only three months, ending Oct. 1st, viz. :—

	Quarter ending Oct. 1, 1867. (Prohibition.)	Quarter ending Oct. 1, 1868. (License.)
Drunks arrested by police	1,728	1,918
Common drunkards	148	134
Disorderly conduct	300	658
Disturbing the peace	257	397
Assaults	433	547
Helped home intoxicated	479	485
	3,345	4,139
Increase in 1868 for 1 quarter		794
Whole number of arrests	1,530	5,596
Lodgers	2,617	7,617
	4,147	13,213
Excess in 3 months of license		9,166
Deduct cases from Roxbury, annexed to Boston in 1868		617
Net increase under license		8,549

Comparing six months of prohibition, in 1867, with six months, in 1868, four of which were license months, we find an

Increase of criminal arrests	248
Increase of station-house lodgers	3,838
Increase of drunks, assaults, &c	1,363
Total increase under licenses	5,449

The Prison Registers, by returns made from all the State and County Prisons in Massachusetts, and the City Prison of Boston, furnish the following figures :—

	For 6 months ending April 1, 1867.	For 6 months ending April 1, 1868.
Committed for drunkenness	2,116	2,576
Committed for violating liquor laws	165	70
	2,281	2,646
Increase under license		365
Committed for all offences	5,975	6,426
Increase under license		451

	Ap. 1 to Oct 1, 1867.	Ap. 1 to Oct. 1, 1868
Committed for drunkenness	2,501	3,170
Increase under licenses		669
Committed for all offences	6,303	7,098
Increase under licenses		795
Vagrants for year ending Sept. 30th, 1867		25,621
Vagrants for year ending Sept, 30th, 1868		56,382
Increase under license		30,761
Total expenditure of cities and towns for support of paupers, 1867		$758,360
Total expenditure of cities and towns for support of paupers, 1868		$832,501
Increase under licenses		$74,141

From the Report Board State Charities, 1868.

Here follow the arrests for drunkenness in the twelve cities at that time in Massachusetts and in the city of Boston :

	In twelve Cities.	In Boston.
1868 Under stringent license	6,644	18,474
1867 Under enforced prohibition	4,685	13,800
Increase under license	1,959	4,674

Here are committals through the State:

	State Prisons.	Jails.
1868 Stringent license	180	7,850
1867 Enforced prohibition	128	5,770
Increase under license	52	2,080

New Bedford shows as follows :—

	Whole arrests.	Drunks.
1867 Under enforced prohibition	397	140
1868 Under license	493	278
Increase under license	96	138

RE-ENACTMENT OF PROHIBITORY LAW.

It is little wonder that Governor Claflin, with such facts as these before him, recommended, in 1868, a return to the Prohibitory Law, or that the Legislature, thinking with him,

repealed the License Law of 1868, and re-enacted the Prohibitory Law of 1867; so that the "Stringent License Law," heralded with such a chorus of anticipative benefits, proved an ignominious failure, and, after a single year's trial, was repealed, to make place for Prohibition.

The Prohibitory Law of 1869 was not allowed by its enemies to remain intact. The delusive cry of "light wines and malts as a preventive to spirit drinking" was raised, and in 1870 a clause was tacked on to the law, permitting the free sale of these drinks. No testimony can be more clear or emphatic than that this led to great evil, and effectually hampered the working of the Prohibitory Law, as, under the guise of beer, all kinds of liquor could be sold with impunity. So, in 1873, the Beer clause was repealed, and the law began its good work again. Again the liquor interest united, and in the session of 1874 repealed both the Prohibitory Law and the State constabulary, instituted for its enforcement. Governor Talbot vetoed both these; they formed a main issue in the autumn elections, and, in November, a majority at the polls declared against both measures. A License Law with local option clauses was enacted in 1875, and has since been in operation.

The lessons to be drawn from the above are:—

1. That the Prohibitory Law of Massachusetts enacted in 1852 was for a time partly inoperative in the cities and larger towns through non-enforcement by authorities, either apathetic or in sympathy with the traffic.

2. That in 1865, with the appointment of the State constabulary, it began to be well enforced until in 1867 it attained its maximum of strictness and efficiency. Then its enemies combined and replaced it by a stringent License Law, enacted in 1868.

3. This License Law resulted in an increase of crime, drunkenness and demoralization so marked that it was allowed to remain in force *only one year*, when it was replaced by the old Prohibitory Law.

4. The efficiency of this law was seriously impaired by the enactment of the Free Beer clause, which ran from 1870 to 1873, when it was repealed and the Prohibitory Law in its entirety came into force in 1874, and began to pinch so hard that a desperate effort was made by the liquor interest, and a repeal brought about in 1875.

5. Massachusetts in 1875 did not go back to absolute license, *but to a local option license law;* and under the exercise of that option from *one-half to three-fourths of the territory of the State has since been free from the legal sale of strong drink.*

AN UNFAIR ATTEMPT.

An attempt has been made to show by comparing statistics of drunkenness in Massachusetts for the years 1874 and 1877, that license decreases drunkenness. The statistics are as follows :—

	Under Proh. Law, 1874.	Under License Law, 1877.
Arrests for Drunkenness	28,044	20,657
Convictions for Drunkenness.....	23,981	17,862
Number of places where liquors are illegally sold, 1874.....	5,609	———
Number of places licensed to sell, (1877).....	———	5,273
Judgment for illegal sales.....	3,644	1,693

The fallacy in the above lies in assuming that 1874 was a full prohibition year, and that 1877 was a full license year. What are the facts ?

In 1874, at the Session of the Legislature, early in the spring, the Prohibitory Law was repealed, as also the State constabulary law. The laws were only saved by the veto of Governor Talbot. Both these questions entered as a main issue into the election campaign of the summer and autumn, and in November the electors, at the polls, sustained the repeal of the measures. From spring to November there was no efficient enforcement of these laws, for the *legislature had given its voice against them.* From November till the end of the year there was *no enforcement* of the law, for the *people had declared against it.* The fact of 5,609 places of sale being open proves the non-efficiency.

No fair-minded man will, therefore, believe 1874 to be a test year of prohibition. Still less is 1877 to be considered a test year of license, for, under the local option clause of the law in 1877, only 95 cities and towns out of the 344 in Massachusetts, granted licenses for the beverage sale of intoxicating liquors, while 249 WERE UNDER PROHIBITION—OVER 72 PER CENT OF THE CITIES AND TOWNS IN THE WHOLE STATE.*

The absurdity of calling 1877 a year of license for a State in which *only* 28 *per cent. of its towns and cities allowed licenses for the* sale of liquors as a beverage is apparent at a glance.

Again, it is odd enough that in 1877, by the above tables, there is not a single place in the whole State of Massachusetts where liquor is sold without license! Does any one believe that?

Lastly, in 1876 commenced that wonderful movement in Massachusetts which drew fully 50,000 drinking men from the saloons, and ranked them among the Blue and Red-ribbon Reform Clubs. Surely this had much to do with decrease in drunkenness. The just conclusions with reference to this attempt then are:—

1. 1874 is by no means a typical prohibition year—the law had been pronounced against both by legislature and people, and so stood no chance for fair enforcement.

2. 1877 is still less a typical license year—72 p.c. of the cities and towns *did not grant license;* only 28 p.c. did grant license.

3. The decrease in drunkenness in 1877 as compared with 1874 is due, therefore, to the large area of the State under prohibition, aided by the unprecedented moral force of the reform movement.

* Page 168, Report Bureau Statistics, Mass., for 1879.

CHAPTER VI.

OTHER EXAMPLES OF PROHIBITION.

Who that has attempted to talk in favour of strict legal enactments, has not met over and over again the stereotyped and ready objection, "Prohibition has always failed." And yet it is true that wherever prohibition has been fairly tried, it has always proved eminently successful in diminishing drunkenness and crime, and promoting sobriety, thrift, and happiness. In this chapter we propose to collate the principal illustrations of this fact, in as concise and simple a way as possible; and, first, we will direct our attention to Great Britain.

IRELAND.

Bessbrook.—A manufacturing town in County Armagh founded by J. Grubb Richardson, and conducted on temperance principles. It has no police, no paupers, no pawnbrokers, and, as a sufficient explanation of so strange an anomaly, *no licensed public-house.* There is no drunkenness in Bessbrook, and the operatives are said to be models of thrift and good order. More than 3,000 hands are employed in its linen mills. The London *Daily Telegraph* thus speaks of it:—

When we heard of a compact village or settlement with a population equal to that of a county town, and so mixed in the forms of religious faith as to support churches and chapels outwardly imposing and inwardly commodious, yet so harmoniously agreed upon one point as to exclude whiskey and strong drinks of all kinds, we were perhaps pardonably sceptical, and were at least curious enough to look into the matter. So I carried an inquiring mind into Bessbrook; and though I made no domiciliary visits worth mentioning, nor stopped any operative to search him or her for the secret bottle, I can truly report that the evidence was strongly in favour of universal and seldom broken sobriety—that is to say, of rigid and total abstinence from all stimulating liquor. The "patriarchal relations" between employers and employed are not maintained at any sacrifice of

independence, nor are they enforced at all. . . . . Bessbrook has 4,000 inhabitants, many of whom are too young for labour in the mill. One penny for each child is paid weekly by the parents for schooling. There is a shop of every necessary kind in the place ; there is a temperance hotel, but there is no house licensed for the sale of beer or spirits. It is also a boast of Bessbrook that the pawn-office is neither known nor missed in those prudent precincts ; and more wonderful yet there is no police station.

Tyrone.—In Tyrone County there is an area of sixty-one square miles, with a population of 10,000, without public-house or beer-shop. Lord Claude Hamilton, M.P., speaking of it in 1870, said :—

I propose at once to allude to the remarkable success of restriction there, because that success has been much questioned. I am here as representing the county, to assure you that the facts stated regarding the success of prohibition there are perfectly accurate. There is a district in that county of sixty-one square miles, inhabited by nearly 10,000 people, having three great roads communicating with market towns, in which there are no public-houses, entirely owing to the self-action of the inhabitants. The result has been that whereas those high roads were in former times the constant scenes of strife and drunkenness necessitating the presence of a considerable number of police to be located in the district, at present there is not a single policeman in that district, the poor-rates are half what they were before, and all the police and magistrates testify to the great absence of crime.

Sunday Closing in Scotland.—In 1854, by the passage of the Forbes McKenzie Act, the Sunday sale of liquor was forbidden in Scotland, and one-seventh of the year put under close prohibition. The result was most marked and beneficent. Taking Glasgow and Edinburgh as illustrations, the following are the cases of drunkenness for three years before and three years after the law came into force :—

	3 years before the law.	3 years after the law.		3 years before the law.	3 years after the law.
Glasgow	24,019	19,434	Edinburgh	9,670	8,561
	23,788	16,266		9,792	8,018
	23,841	17,446		9,443	7,324
	71,648	53,146		28,905	23,903
Decrease in 3 years..		18,502	Decrease in 3 years..		5,002

In thirty-one cities in Scotland the cases of Sunday drunkenness and crime

For the year before the law, were.....11,471
For the year after the law..... 4,299

A decrease of..... 7,172

or about 65 per cent.

From the report of the prisons of Scotland, it appears that in five years previous to the Act, the average daily number of criminals therein was 14,676, and for the succeeding five, 11,507, a daily decrease of *over three thousand!* In 1852 the apprehensions for drunkenness on Sunday in Edinburgh were 729; in 1873 only 153.

The sale of spirits for

The seven years ending 1852, was 6,825,320 gallons yearly.
" " " " 1861, " 5,392,000 " "

a decrease of 21 per cent.

Compared with England and Wales we have the following statistics as to consumption of liquors:

	Scotland.	England and Wales.
	Gallons	Gallons
1850	7,122,987	9,331,512
1851	6,830,710	9,595,368
1852	7,172,015	9,820,608
	21,125,712	28,747,488
1880	6,325,036	16,950,020
1881	6,562,259	17,044,967
1882	6,502,955	16,811,494
	19,390,250	50,806,481
	Decrease 8 per cent.	Increase 76 per cent.

After twenty-four years' experience of this prohibitory law for one-seventh of the time, it has so commended itself to the approbation of the people of Scotland, that, when a similar measurse for Ireland was enacted in the British House of Commons, in 1878, 43 out of the 48 Scotch voting members ardently supported it.

Sunday Closing in Ireland :—In 1878 the British Parliament passed the Bill for closing liquor shops in Ireland on the Sabbath. This became law, in all but five of the largest cities, October 13th of the same year. Its effect on drinking, drunkenness and crime, was marked and instantaneous. By the Excise returns the drink bill of Ireland for 1878, exclusive of foreign spirits and wines, amounted to £10,952,-329. In 1879 it had fallen to £9,374,695, a reduction in a single year of £1,576,534. The Criminal and Judicial Returns for 1878 showed a reduction in cases of punishable drunkenness over those of 1877 of 3,180, although the Act was in force but ten weeks of the year 1878. The same returns for 1879 show :—

Total of summary cases of crime.....	1878,	268,599
" " " "	1879,	255,670
A reduction under Sunday closing.....		12,889
Total cases of punishable drunkenness.....	1878,	107,723
" " " "	1879,	99,021
A decrease under Sunday closing of.....		8,702

And Dr. Neilson Hancock, Government statistician, in his report for 1879, page 16, thus refers to the above :—

These figures show a decrease for the first time in six years, and of a very large amount—12,889. Of this decrease no less than 8,702 was in punishable drunkenness. This may be fairly ascribed to the passing of the Sunday Closing Act, which was in operation the whole year. In 1878, when it was in operation for a quarter of a year only, there was a decrease in these convictions of 3,180.

For the three and one-half years preceding Sunday closing, the arrests for drunkenness on Sunday were		15,942
For the three and one-half years succeeding, the arrests were		6,788
Decrease		9,154
Total consumption of Beer and Spirits.....	1877,	£12,196,915
" " " "	1882,	£11,042,520
Decrease.....		£ 1,154,395
Total arrests for drunkenness.....	1877,	110,903
" " " "	1882,	87,000
Decrease.....		23,903

The beneficial results have been so apparent that the Act which, in 1878, was a temporary measure introduced by a private member, and did not extend to the five chief cities of Ireland, was, in 1884, introduced as a Government measure and its provisions extended to the whole Island. Mr. Trevelyan, Under Secretary of State for Ireland, in its introduction made the following remarks :—

The statistics for this year fully bears out the statistics of last year and of previous years, and they show that in the towns where Sunday closing does not exist, the Sunday drunkenness is in a percentage of twenty to one in comparison with the towns in which Sunday closing does exist. Indeed, there is nothing whatever in the statistics which, in regard to Sunday drunkenness, will in any respect alter the conclusions which have been drawn from the statistics of previous years.

So we find in Ireland, Bessbrook, a town of 4,000 people, and in Tyrone County, an area of sixty-one square miles, with 10,000 inhabitants, in which prohibition has been worked for years, and with the remarkable results above stated. Again, a prohibitory law—closing up the bars for one-seventh of the year in all Ireland, with the exception of her five largest cities—works so well as, in a single year, to save to her people £1,576,634 cash, to diminish her crime by 12,889, and her punishable drunkenness by 8,702 cases. Can anything be clearer as to the value and feasibility of prohibition fairly applied ?

ENGLAND.

Canterbury.—Within the limits of the Ecclesiastical Province of Canterbury (comprising thirty-two English counties, together with North and South Wales) there are to-day about 1,500 parishes, in which there is *neither* public-house nor beer-shop. The population of these parishes is nearly 250,000, thus showing to the world a quarter of a million of freedom-loving English people who have been and are living contentedly and happily under total and complete prohibition. As early as 1869, a report of the House of Convocation, presented to the Queen, in speaking of these parishes, says :

Few, it may be believed, are cognizant of the fact—which has been elicited by the present inquiry—that there are at this time, within the

Province of Canterbury, upwards of one thousand parishes in which there is neither public-house nor beer-shop; and where, in consequence of the absence of these inducements to crime and pauperism, according to the evidence before the Committee, the intelligence, morality, and comfort of the people are such as the friends of temperance would have anticipated.

In the appendix to the report, under the head of "Good effects of having no public-house or beer-shop," are given extracts from replies of 243 of the clergy, and 11 of chief constables and superintendents of police. They are all condensed arguments for prohibition: "No public-house, no beer-shop—no crime." "No public-house, no beer-shop—no intemperance." In parishes where there are neither public-houses nor beer-shops, the absence of crime is remarkable.

English Estates.—The Edinburgh *Review* of January, 1873, alluding to the suppression of the liquor traffic by the land proprietors, says:—

We have seen a list of eighty-nine estates in England and Scotland where the drink traffic has been altogether suppressed, with the very happiest social results. The late Lord Palmerston suppressed the beer-shops in Romsey as the leases fell in. We know an estate which stretches for miles along the romantic shore of Loch Fyne where no whiskey is allowed to be sold. The peasants and fisherman are flourishing. They have all their money in the bank, and they obtain higher wages than their neighbours when they go to sea.

Low Moor.—A settlement founded by the Messrs. Garnett, and of which one of the partners writes, in 1875:—

We send some account of the community at Low Moor, which we are happy to say still remains without a beer-shop or a public-house. Indeed, we are deficient of so many of the usual adjuncts of civilization that we occasionally fancy it is like no other place—certainly it is like none with which we are acquainted. It has neither doctor, lawyer, nor, until lately, parson nor magistrate, neither has it a constable or policeman. It has neither public-house nor beer-shop, dram-shop, pawn-shop, or tommy-shop. It has neither stocks nor gaol, nor lock-up. We have a population of about 1,100. Our people can sleep with their doors open, and we have the finest fruit in the district, in season, in our mill windows (which are never fastened) without any ever being stolen. Our death-rate is, perhaps, the lowest in the kingdom, taking the average of the last twelve years it is under sixteen in the thousand.

Shaftesbury Park Estate,—of which a writer in an English paper, in 1875, says:—

Here, as you are probably aware, no public-house or beer-shop exists. We have here some fourteen hundred houses, with a population of from three to four thousand, and yet it is a fact that the duties of citizens, of fathers and mothers, of neighbours, and of individuals, are satisfactorily discharged, without its being thought necessary to call in the aid of the publican. During the period of my own residence on that estate, I have seen only two drunken men, and they, moreover, were passing through the streets, not citizens. I have never heard a drunken brawl, never known but one case of a domestic disturbance, and that arose from a husband "mildly correcting" a wife, who, before coming on the estate, had learned to be too fond of her beer. Strange as it may appear, the inhabitants, *though by no means exclusively teetotalers, are perfectly satisfied,* and do not wish that great institution—the beer barrel—to be introduced.

Saltaire.—This is a manufacturing settlement in Yorkshire, under the management of the Messrs. Salt. It has a population of 5,000, and is under strict prohibitory rule.

Mr. James Hole, in his "Homes of the Working Classes," thus writes of it:—

One thing there is which is not to be found in Saltaire, and Mr. Salt deserves as much praise for its absence as he does for anything he has provided. Not a public-house or beer-shop is there. And what are the results? Briefly these. There are scarcely ever any arrears in rent. Infant mortality is very low as compared with that of Bradford, from which place the majority of hands have come. Illegitimate births are rare. The tone and self-respect of the work-people are much greater than that of factory hands generally. The wages are not high, but they enable them to secure more of the comforts and decencies of life than they could elsewhere, owing to the facilities placed within their reach, and the absence of drinking-houses.

So we have 1,500 English parishes, with a population of 250,000 souls, Low Moor, with over 1,000 people, Saltaire, with 5,000, and numerous large and populous estates, all testifying to and enjoying the priceless benefits of strict and steady prohibition. The public-house and beer-shop are banished, business prospers, liberty flourishes, and the people are thrifty, prosperous, and happy. Such failures as these can very well be borne.

Vermont.—This State passed a prohibitory law in 1852, and has never repealed it. To-day it is so strongly entrenched in the regard of the people that no political party could live for a moment on a basis of opposition to it. From time to time its provisions have been strengthened, and its enforcement gradually improved. From the many testimonies to its worth, we have room for but three.

Governor Peck, Judge of the Supreme Court, says of it:—

I think the influence of the law has been salutary in diminishing drunkenness and disorders arising therefrom, and also crimes generally. You cannot change the habits of a people momentarily. The law has an effect upon our customs, and has done away with treating and promiscuous drinking. The law has been *aided by moral means*, but moral means have also been wonderfully strengthened by the law.

I think the law is educating the people, and that a much larger number now support it than when it was adopted; in fact, the opposition is dying out. All the changes in the law have been in the direction of greater stringency. In attending to court for ten years, I do not remember to have seen a drunken man.

Governor Convers testified, in 1874:—

The prohibitory law has been in force about twenty-two years. The enforcement has been uniform in the State since its enactment, and I consider it a very desirable law. I think the law itself educates and advances public sentiment in favour of temperance. There is no question about the decrease in the consumption of liquor. I speak from personal knowledge, having always lived in the State. I live in Woodstock, sixty miles from here, and there no man having the least regard for himself would admit selling rum, even though no penalty were attached to it.

Hepworth Dixon, in his letters to the English papers, in 1874, gives a beautiful description of St. Johnsbury—Vermont's principal city—in the course of which he says:—

What are the secrets of this artizans' paradise? Why is that place so clean, the people so well housed and fed? Why are the little folks so hale in face, so smart in person, so neat in dress? All voices, I am bound to say, reply to me, that these unusual, yet desirable, conditions in a workmen's village spring from a strict enforcement of the law prohibiting the sale of any species of intoxicating drink. . . . The men of Vermont, like those of other northern States, have adopted that public Act, which is known to the English jesters and good fellows under the opprobrious title of the Maine Liquor Law. . . . The Maine Liquor Law

is a stringent Act, and it is carried out in parts of the New England States with the unflinching rigour of an Arctic frost. . . . Are there no protests? None, or next to none; as year by year goes by, more persons come to see the benefits of our rule. The men who formerly drank most are now the staunchest members of our reform. The men who used to dress in rags are growing rich. Many of them live in their own houses. They attend their churches, and their children go to school. These facts are not to be suppressed by shrugs and sneers. No authority is visible at St. Johnsbury. No policeman walks the streets—on ordinary days there is nothing for a policeman to do. Six constables are enrolled for duty, but the men are all at work in the scale factories, and only don their uniforms on special days to make a little show.

Potter County.—This is in Pennsylvania, and has a population of 14,000. Twenty years ago it was so noted for its drunkenness that attention was drawn to the subject, and the people elected associate judges pledged to refuse all license applications for five years. The improvement was so visible that no-license judges were a second time elected for a period of five years. Before the expiry of their term, the Legislature was induced to pass a law prohibiting licenses in the county. For twenty years they have had no licensed hotel or restaurant; there are sufficient places for public accommodation, but no bars in them. Judge Williams, in 1880, gives the following testimony:—

As to results, I can say that, while the county has been steadily growing in population and business, pauperism and crime have steadily decreased. For the past five years the county jail has been fully one-half the time without any other inmate than the keeper and his family. Twice within the past ten years I have, at the regular terms of court, discharged the jury on the second day of the term, without their having been called to consider a single case of any description. The effect of this system is felt in many ways; taxes are reduced, the business of the criminal courts greatly diminished, industry and sobriety take the place of idleness and dissipation, and intelligence and morality are advanced.

But one effort has been made to repeal this local law, and that has failed by reason of the decided protest of a majority of the taxpayers of the county.

The Prothonotary of Potter County, O. H. Crosby, Esq., in a letter dated Coudersport, Pa., March 12, 1880, writes:—

At our December term of court we had no jury, for we had nothing for them to do. We have no poorhouse in the county, for we have no use for one. Potter county has had no licenses to sell whiskey for nearly thirty years. Therefore our jail is empty about ten months in the year.

From Report, Board of State Charities, 1880, we quote the following :—

In reply to your circular of the 16th, we report that the only public building or institution in Potter County, subject to visitation, is our county jail. Nearly one-half the time it is tenantless, owing, in a great measure, no doubt, to our prohibitory liquor law, and as there is no necessity for a workshop to be attached to it, there is nothing of account to report in reference to it.

Maryland.—In this State local option has to be specially enacted by the Legislature for each county, and then adopted by a popular vote. The first county to gain this boon was Worcester, 1874. The advance has been steady and rapid, at the present writing very nearly *one-half* of the State has adopted, and is now carrying out, the prohibition policy. The results have more than justified expectations. From the official reports of the President of the State Prisoners' Aid Society of 1876 and 1880, we extract the following testimonies :—

Worcester Co.—At Snow Hill I found one prisoner. The Local Option law has greatly diminished crime in this county.

Caroline Co.—In the jail here (July, 10, 1879) I found no prisoners. In speaking to the Sheriff and other gentlemen about the few offences committed in the county, I found that they attributed to the Local Option law, which has been rigidly enforced, and has certainly had a most wonderful effect in diminishing the number of arrests, and elevating the moral condition of the people generally.

Hartford Co.—It is a source of gratification to know that Hartford County has been redeemed from the liquor traffic, and drunkenness curtailed throughout its districts.

Talbot Co.—At Easton the jail contains only one prisoner. The Sheriff remarked that the Local Option law in their county had produced a very happy effect in the diminution of crime ; that during the court term, April, 1874, they had seventeen prisoners ; in April, 1875, only nine, and these were committed before the law went into operation. Since then one or two arrests were made for petty offences, but not retained.

I have never been more thoroughly convinced of the great importance and advantage of the rigid enforcement of the Local Option law than at the present time. In travelling through Talbot, Dorchester, Caroline, and Kent counties, during three weeks of last August, I did not meet a single person under the influence of liquor, for in most all the districts of these counties the Local Option law is enforced. I next visited Queen Ann's County, where they have three districts where the Local Option law exists, and three where it does not. I reached Centerville on Sunday afternoon, about

four o'clock, and had only been a few minutes in the place when I saw several men reeling along the street, scarcely able to stand. In visiting the jail, I learned that 163 prisoners had been committed to the jail from January, 1878, to August, 1879, and that almost all of these prisoners had been sent from these three districts where the Local Option law does not exist. In several visits made to Denton, Caroline County, where the Local Option law has been rigidly enforced for the past five or six years, and has been proven beyond a doubt to be a grand success, I found no prisoner in the jail, and by consulting the jail record, found that only 33, for petty offences, had been committed from January, 1878, to August, 1879. The Sheriff stated that now they really had very little use for a jail in this county. Taxes have also been reduced year after year.

Judicial statistics confirm the above testimony in a wonderful degree. For the three terms of court immediately preceding the adoption of prohibition, the presentments made by the Grand Jury were—For Caroline Co., 45; Worcester Co., 116; and Dorchester Co., 100. For the three terms of court immediately succeeding the enforcement of prohibition, the presentments made by the Grand Jury were—For Caroline Co., 22; Worcester Co., 38; and Dorchester Co., 57, a falling off in crime of 60 per cent. In Worcester Co., the fees of the State's Attorney fell during the first year of the enforcement of the law, from $1,200 to about $300, and the State's Attorney for Talbot Co. reports a nearly similar experience.

The President of the State Prisoners' Aid Society concludes his report as follows:—

The Local Option law has produced the most favourable results. Of this I have the strongest evidence in the decrease of prisoners, which I noticed in my visitations to certain counties, and in such districts where the law has been enforced. I have made diligent efforts to procure information from reliable parties. I have examined the prisons, and held special interviews with the Sheriffs and other officers, who were expected to know its effects, and am informed that it has produced the most decided and happy changes in promoting peace, safety, and quiet where formerly riot, noise, and disorder prevailed; especially on public days and on Saturday nights after the workingmen were paid off.

Vineland, New Jersey, Pop. 11,000.—This town was founded in 1861, by the Hon. Chas. K. Landis, and from its commencement has allowed no traffic in intoxicating liquors. The license question is submitted to the public

each spring, and scarcely more than a score or two of persons can be found to vote in its favour. From 1867 to 1872, inclusive, the police expenses of the town averaged $70, and the poor expenses $390 per year. In 1873, Mr. Landis, in an address before the Judiciary Committee of the New Jersey Legislature, said :—

There is a material and industrial prosperity existing in Vineland which, though I say it myself, is unexampled in the history of colonization, and must be due to more than ordinary causes. The influence of temperance upon the health and industry of her people is no doubt the principal of these causes. Started when the country was plunged in civil war, its progress was continually onward. Young as the settlement was, it sent its quota of men to the field, and has paid over $60,000 of war debts. The settlement has built twenty fine school houses, ten churches, and kept one of the finest systems of road improvements, covering 178 miles, in this country. There are now some fifteen manufacturing establishments on the Vineland tract, and they are constantly increasing in number. Her stores in extent and buildings will rival any other place in South Jersey. There are seventeen miles of railroad upon the tract, embracing six railway stations. The amount of products sent away to market is enormous. The poorest of her people seek to make their home beautiful.

The following letter is among the latest testimony from Vineland :—

VINELAND, N. J., May 17, 1880.

DEAR SIR,—Having been very busy it has been impossible to answer yours sooner. As regards the temperance feature of this town there is no change. We vote on the license question every spring, and to the best of my recollection, out of a voting population of an average of 1,200, the vote in favour of license has not been in any year over thirty-five or forty. When a liquor dealer shows his head some one or other goes for him. Three places that have been selling slyly were closed this spring, one of the parties was locked up for months, the others fined and broken up.

We have no paupers ; but we appropriate $600 a year to assist deserving poor.

Our police cost us just $100 per annum. Habitual drunkards we have none, or at least I never see any, and know of none. I have lived here twelve years and feel that I am posted, We have a small lock-up that is only used for occasional tramps. While we have no liquor saloons we have twenty-four school houses, one of them costing $30,000. We have excellent churches of all denominations, some them costing $20,000 and $25,000. An earthquake would not shake this community any more than a licensed saloon.

Respectfully,

S. R. FOWLER, P.M.

Comparing Vineland, N. J., with New Britain, Conn., in 1873, let us mark the instructive result. Both are cities largely engaged in manufacturing, and have a population of 11,000 each. Vineland is under effective prohibition, whilst New Britain is under license :

	New Britain.	Vineland.
Cost of pauperism	$ 8,500	$224
Police	7,500	75
Liquor sold	319,000	00
Habitual drunkards	497	27
Dramshops	80	00

New Britain has one drunkard to every twenty-two persons ; Vineland one to every four hundred persons. The valuation of property in Vineland is $4,500,000, and the taxation is only 3½ mills on the dollar.

Carrol Co., Georgia.—This has afforded one of the most significant instances of the success of prohibition ever recorded. We quote extracts from a recently published statement by President Haygood of Emory College.

No county in Georgia had more still-houses and bar-rooms to the number of inhabitants than Carrol, twenty years ago. Drinking-places were not only to be found in the little towns, but also at the cross-roads and country places throughout the country. No more unfavourable place for the success of prohibition could have been selected than this county. It was settled by a class of citizens who regarded plenty of corn whiskey and peach brandy as essential to good living. Liquor was sold without scruple and drank without stint. Many of the people spent all their means, beyond a bare living, for strong drink. Education and churches were neglected. Ignorance and vice prevailed to such an alarming extent that the very name of the county became a by-word and reproach in the State.

Some determined men set to work to remedy this state of things, and after twelve years of earnest work secured the passage of a bill by the Legislature prohibiting the sale of liquor. Speaking of the results President Haygood continues :—

1. The trade of the town has been more than doubled. Before the liquor traffic was abolished the trade of the place was about $200,000 a year ; now it is about $500,000 a year. There are thirty stores in town, and I do not know of a single merchant amongst them who would not vote against the liquor traffic on purely business grounds. John W. Stewart,

who has made a fortune, says, as a business man, that he would not have liquor back for any consideration. Some of our leading merchants were opposed to prohibition at first, because they feared that it would injure their trade. They are unanimously in favor of it now. The $30,000 that was spent here for whiskey prior to 1875 is now spent in building houses, improving stock, draining lands and paying taxes. The farmers are nearly all out of debt. Many of the men who were spending all their money for whiskey have quit drinking and are making a support for their families.

2. The argument that men would drink anyhow does not hold good but with very few. Perhaps there are in every town some few men who have drank so long that they are slaves to the habit. Such men would send off and get whiskey and drink anyhow. But we have learned that, with nearly all the people, whiskey is like watermelons, the supply creates the demand. Do away with the supply and there will be no demand, as a general thing. By prohibiting the sale of whiskey in the towns of Georgia we will soon have a generation of young men who will have no desire for it whatever.

3. In a moral point of view, the results of this movement in our town have been perfectly remarkable. The solicitor of this judicial circuit says there is less crime in this county than any other in the circuit. Most of the people have joined the church. Profanity is almost unknown. On the train that comes daily into Carrolton, not an officer on it ever swears an oath. The soberness and quiet which prevails here, even on election days and court week, strike visitors as being wonderful. At a barbecue last year, though there were together about 4000 people, Col. Thomas Hardeman, who spoke on the occasion, said that he never saw a drunken man. He regarded it as something almost new under the sun."

Edwards Co., Illinois.—In the following significant facts lately submitted by the Clerk of the Circuit Court of the county, the economy of temperance is strikingly illustrated :—

There has not been a licensed saloon in this county for over twenty-five years. During that time our jail has not averaged an occupant. This county never sent but one person to the penitentiary, and that man was sent up for killing his wife while drunk on whiskey which he had obtained from a licensed saloon in an adjoining county. We have but very few paupers in our poorhouse, sometimes only three or four. Our taxes are thirty-two per cent. lower than they are in adjoining counties where saloons are licensed. Our people are prosperous, peaceable, and sober, there being very little drinking, except near Grayville, a licensed town of White County, near our border. The different terms of our Circuit Court occupy three or four days each year, and then the dockets are cleared. Our people are so well satisfied with the present state of things that a very large majority of them would bitterly oppose any effort made in favour of license under any circumstances.

Kansas.—In November, 1880, Kansas passed a constitutional amendment prohibiting forever the manufacture and

sale of liquor for beverage purposes. The law giving force to this amendment went into operation May 1, 1881. The Liquor Party made a most determined effort to break down and nullify the law. Topeka, Leavenworth, Atchison, and Lawrence, the principal cities of the State, openly set it at defiance. An appeal against the constitutionality of the law was taken, but it was unsuccessful. Enforcement has been gradually growing in efficiency and area, the law has been vindicated in every part of the State, and is to-day as well carried out as any other existing law.

Result of thirty months' operation.—In December, 1883, a series of questions was mailed to every county attorney, county superintendent, and police judge in the State. Returns were received from 66 of the 81 organized counties. The following is the result :—

Counties having saloons prior to May 1, 1881	66
" now having no saloons	41
" in which there are still saloons	25
" in which prohibition is growing stronger	51
Number of cases tried	972
Number of convictions	729
Aggregate of fines	$95,200
Number imprisoned	81

Aggregate time, 11 years, 5 months, 19 days.

The most of the remaining saloons given above were in Leavenworth, Atchison and Topeka. Since the beginning of 1884, these have been closed out, so that the law is now in full operation throughout the State.

Iowa.—On June 27, 1882, Iowa by a popular majority of 30,000 adopted an amendment to her constitution, prohibiting forever the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes.

The law was tested on appeal and decided by the judges to be void, owing to certain clerical errors which had crept into the records. The wishes of the people were thus set aside. However, the Republican Party in its campaign of 1883, was obliged to pledge itself to the passage of a Prohibitory Law, went to the polls on that issue chiefly, and

was returned by a plurality of over 25,000. On the 1st day of March, 1884, the Iowa Legislature struck the wine and beer clauses from the existing Liquor Law, and thus enacted a strict prohibitory measure. Henceforth Iowa is to be considered a Prohibition State.

Lack of space forbids the continuation of this subject. We believe that an honest, intelligent person will find it impossible to read the foregoing chapters and not be convinced of the practicability and wonderful results of prohibitory legislation. So strong is the evidence in its favour, and so deep a hold has it taken on the public mind, that one can find scarcely a State in the American Union in which there is not an earnest, active, and powerful agitation in progress for the adoption of stringent prohibitory measures. In no State has any backward steps been taken within the past few years, while, in many, radical measures have either succeeded or developed unlooked for strength. Nebraska, in 1881, adopted a law by which the minimum fee for license, in all towns with over 10,000 people, is fixed at $1000, and for all places of less population, $500. North Carolina passed a law in January, 1881, prohibiting the manufacture and sale of liquor in that State, and this was submitted to a popular vote in August, but, unfortunately, defeated through the adverse vote of the negroes, led by the Republican party managers. South Carolina has prohibited the sale of liquor except in incorporated towns, and thus placed the larger part of her territory under prohibition. Tennessee has adopted a law which prohibits the dramshops from being opened within four miles of an incorporated school, and the people are incorporating schools in every direction and thus driving out the saloons. Alabama has nearly half her territory under Local Option Prohibition. Massachusetts refuses to license the sale of liquor in two-thirds of the State. Large areas of New York, Illinois, Wisconsin, Louisiana, New Jersey, and other States are under the sway of prohibition by virtue of Local Option clauses in their License laws. New Hampshire has a prohibitory law, with Option clauses in favour of

malt liquors. In Great Britain the trend is in the direction of stronger restrictive measures looking towards ultimate prohibition. In Canada the people are making their voices and votes felt in the same direction. The coming ten years will probably see the adoption of prohibition over the greater part of the Anglo-Saxon countries.

The aggravated evils of Intemperance which refuse to retire before the unaided power of moral suasion, the happy and beneficent results that have everywhere arisen from fairly enforced prohibitory laws, and the earnest good sense of a generation which is determined to put this "gigantic crime of crimes" beneath its ban, will work hand in hand to bring about the long looked for day, when legalized drunkard-making shall be no longer condoned or supported by a Christian people in a Christian country.

CHAPTER VII.

COMPARATIVE STATISTICS.

Nothing has been more common, with opponents of the Canada Temperance Act, than the assertion that crime is more rife in Maine than in countries under license; and nothing could well be more untrue to fact. A consideration of the following statistics, carefully compiled from official sources, will enable one to estimate for himself the truthfulness of this oft-repeated assertion. Of course, no one will contend that the number of arrests for drunkenness is, in all cases, an absolutely correct test of the amount of drunkenness in a community. The greater or less stringency of the authorities in making arrests introduces a variable element. But in a comparison between license and prohibitory communities, the advantage is altogether with the former; for, where prohibitory laws are carried out, arrests are more strict and prosecutions more vigorous. In cities situated in prohibitory countries, the arrests for drunkenness are especially misleading; for to cities come hard drinkers from the rural districts, where it is impossible to get liquor, and these help to swell the number arrested for drunkenness in the cities. Thus the arrests in Portland, Maine, are no test of the drunkenness among the citizens of Portland alone, for these arrests include persons from the surrounding counties, who, unable to find liquor at home, make the best use of all possible facilities when in the city, and so add to its apparent drunkenness. Bearing this in mind let us undertake our investigations. And for this purpose Ontario may be chosen to represent Canada, chiefly because Ontario has the best system of criminal statistics. First then let us glance at

ONTARIO'S REMARKABLE INCREASE IN CRIME

during the past fifteen years, and the official reasons given therefor. This will satisfy any honest citizen of the hollow-

ness of the cry so often raised, that things are quite well enough now, and there is no need for further legislation.

Year.	Total commitments for all crimes.	Intemperate.	Total sentenced to Jails and Penitentiaries.	Total Drunk and Disorderly.
1869....	5655	3443	not given	1793
1870....	6379	4080	....	2263
1871....	6615	4046	....	2194
1872....	6958	4261	4643	2615
1873....	7877	5444	5236	3197
1874....	9488	6460	6325	3370
1875 ...	10073	6392	6281	3663
1876....	11236	6542	7011	3868
1877....	13481	8268	8470	4032
1878....	12030	7895	7824	3785
1879....	11220	7805	6800	3581
1880....	11300	7751	7036	3795
1881....	9229	6495	5848	3328
1882....	9620	6678	5920	3497
1883....	9880	7502	6300	3895
Total,.....	141,041	86,520	77,694	44,908
Average,.....	9,403	6,204	6,474	3,252

From this table it will be seen that there has been a most remarkable increase in crime since 1869, reaching its maximum in 1877, and then decreasing until 1881, since which time it is again on the increase. The very large proportion of intemperate and commitments for drunkenness and disorderly conduct is startling and suggestive.

For the 15 years included above, the average yearly arrests for drunkenness and disorderly conduct is 34 per cent. of the average total commitments.

As to the causes of this astonishing increase of crime, let the Official Reports themselves speak. The Report of the Inspector of Prisons for Ontario, in 1874, page 67, ascribes this excessive increase of crime as specially due :

To a very marked increase in sale and consumption of intoxicating liquors, resulting in an increase of drunkenness, disorderly conduct, vagrancy, and crime. The increased revenue receipts of the Province from Licenses to sell liquor in a retail way, is sufficient proof that the traffic, in its most objectionable form, is increasing in volume every year.

Statistics show this increase to have been over one hundred per cent. in the past eight years. That such increase in the use of intoxicating liquors,

is producing a more than corresponding increase in drunkenness, pauperism and crime, the observation and experience of every observing man abundantly proves. And this conclusion is fully corroborated by the criminal statistics attached to this report.

For the past two years 53 per cent. of the entire committals to our common jails were those dealt with for drunk and disorderly conduct and vagrancy. The proportion of committals for these offences during the four preceding years was 49 per cent. of the whole number, proving conclusively that at least one-third of the year's increase is directly due to the excessive use of intoxicating liquors, and can it be denied that another one-third is not directly due to the same cause? For four years preceding 1873-74, 61 per cent. of the entire committals were of intemperate habits; during the past two years, 68 per cent.—an increase of 7 per cent. in two years. It is clear, therefore, that drunkenness has been the most fruitful cause of the excessive increase in our jail population for the past two years.

In the Report of 1877, page 56, we find:

The committals for offences against public order and peace have increased 200 per cent. in the last eight years, clearly showing that while crime and criminals have increased very largely, and in much greater ratio than the ordinary population, offenders against public order and peace—chiefly drunken, disorderly, and vagrant characters, have increased to an enormous extent.

On page 69 and 70 of the Report for 1880, we read:—

The offences against "public order and peace," of which drunkenness and vagrancy constitute more than nine-tenths, increased from 2,886, in 1869, to 6,640 in 1880, being an increase of 132 per cent. These figures show conclusively that the large increase in the number of commitments to common jails during the past eleven years, and more particularly the abnormally great increase which took place between the years 1883 to 1877, was mainly due to the prevalence of drunkenness, and the kindred offences of vagrancy and disorderly conduct. The number of committals for drunkenness and disorderly conduct shows a small increase in 1880 over the preceding year (1879).

From page 7 of the Report for 1883, we quote:—

The most deplorable feature is the very large increase in the commitments for drunkenness, the figures being, in 1882, 3,497; in 1883, 3.895, an increase of 398, or 11.38 per cent. The per centage which the commitals for drunkenness bears to the total commitments is 39.42, against 36.35 per cent. in 1882, shewing that, not only are the commitments for this offence numerically greater, but that the proportion they bear to the total commitments is also increased. It is to be hoped that the efforts now being made by the various associations for the promotion of temperance, will have the effect of reducing the large number who find their way, through this vice, to the jails of the Province. There is also an increase of 105, or 7.24 per cent., in the committals for vagrancy, as compared with the previous year.

This startling increase in crime will still be more apparent if we compare 1869 with 1879 in commitments for various crimes :—

	1869.	1879.		p.c.
Felonious assault	46	125	incr'se	172
Cutting, wounding, stabbing and shooting	31	62	"	100
Rape	27	45	"	66
Attempted suicide	—	6	"	—
Arson	34	49	"	44
Burglary	26	103	"	300
Forgery	22	64	"	200
Fraud	52	131	"	150
Housebreaking and robbery	68	102	"	50
Bigamy	9	14	"	55
Inmates and frequenters of houses of ill-fame	29	189	"	550
Perjury	6	25	"	316
Indecent assault and exposure	8	41	"	412
Drunk and disorderly	1792	3581	"	100
Vagrancy	783	2536	"	230
All crimes	5655	11220	"	100

Does not this remarkable and most deplorable increase of crime, out of all proportion to the increase in population, plead in eloquent terms for some measure of efficient and speedy action ? And when the evidence is indisputable, that by far the greater part of this increase is due to the sale and use of intoxicating liquors, is it not the duty of all good citizens to earnestly consider and speedily put into operation some effective machinery for the suppression of intemperance ? Surely such a state of things is not satisfactory to Canadian citizens.

Let us now return for a moment to

THE STATE OF MAINE.

The cry has been raised that crime is terribly on the increase in that State, and is far greater in proportion to population than in Ontario. Let us see.

Below are given, in separate columns, the jail commitments for all crimes, the number of persons sentenced to State prisons, and to jails, for crimes other than liquor selling, and the number for liquor selling. These have been

compiled from the State Reports, and published by Ex-Governor Dingley:—

Year.	Jail committals for all crimes.	Sentences to State Prison.	Sentences to Jails.	Sentences for violating Liquor Law.
1860	No Official Reports published.	42	46	0
1861		65	36	0
1862		38	36	0
1863		49	40	0
1864		16	32	0
1865		30	41	0
1866		104	94	0
1867		60	85	3
1868		43	53	9
1869		87	81	15
1870		54	73	20
1871		59	58	25
1872		49	20	30
1873		24	36	30
1874		67	51	50
1875	2,199	40	108	60
1876	1,987	70	140	75
1877	2,360	73	113	51
1878	2,225	72	104	86
1879	2,658	74	69	78
1880	2,309	59	73	70

From the above figures we gather the following:—

Sentences to State Prison, 1866-1871 for crimes besides rumselling ... 407
" " 1875-1880 " " 388

Decrease in six years ending 1880. 19
or 4½ per cent.

Sentences to Jails and State Prison, 1866.'71 for crimes besides rumselling 851
" " " 1875-'81 995

Increase in six years ending 1880..... 144
or 17 per cent in six years.

A decrease in higher crimes of $4^1/_2$ per cent., in comparing six years from 1866 with six years from 1875, and an increase of but 17 per cent. in all sentences for crimes outside of rumselling in the same period, is certainly remarkable, especially when we take into account that 1875, '76, '77, and '78 were years of very hard times, when tramps, driven by

penal laws from other States, infested the country, and thefts and larcencies were unusually rife.

	State Prison.	Jails.
1866—year after close of the war—sentenced	104	94
1869	87	81
1880	59	73

From 1860 to 1865 were the years of the war, in which the roving, adventurous, and reckless characters were drawn off to the terrible contest in the South. The roll of criminals is comparatively small. In 1866, the soldiers, camp followers, and adventurers, had returned, and the roll of crime leaps up as it did all over the United States. From that time until the present there has been a gradual lessening of crimes, which would have been even greater, but for the severe season of depression from 1875 to 1878. In 1879 and 1880 the numbers rapidly diminish.

A careful consideration of the above lists and explanations, will sufficiently dispose of the cry of great increase of crime in Maine, and prepare us for the remarkable contrast between Maine and Ontario.

ONTARIO AND MAINE COMPARED.

The following is a table of commitments for all crimes in Ontario and Maine, for the respective years :—

	Commitments for all crimes.		Commitments for drunk and disorderly.	
Year.	Ontario.	Maine.	Ontario.	Maine.
1875	10,073	2,199	3,063	
1876	11,236	1,987	3,868	
1877	13,481	2,360	4,032	
1878	12,030	2,225	3,785	
1879	11,220	2,658	3,581	
1880	11,300	2,309	2,795	
Total for six years	69,340	13,738	22,724	4,579*
Average per year	11,557	2,289	3,786	763

Which shows that Ontario has absolutely nearly FIVE TIMES THE CRIME, and MORE THAN FIVE TIMES THE DRUNKENNESS of Maine; and in proportion to population, nearly TWICE THE CRIME AND DRUNKENNESS! Can any thing be more conclusive?

* Estimated at one-third of the total commitments.

Again, we append a second table of comparison for the year 1880 :—

Committals to Gaol.	Senteneed to over one year imprisonment	Numbers in Prisons and Gaols end of year.	Number in Prisons, Gaols and Reformatories at end of year.	Number in Prisons, Gaols, Reformatories, and Asylums, at end of year.
Ontario 11,300	236	1,597	1,849	4,370
Maine.. 2,309	62	414	534	970

From which it appears that Maine, under all these heads, falls far below Ontario, in its proportion to criminals and lunatics.

Comparing the convicts in the Penitentiaries of Canada with those in the State Prison of Maine, in the years 1870 and 1879, at the rate of increase we find the following :

	Total convicts. 1870.	1879.	Rate of increase.
Canada	811	1,347	66 per cent.
Halifax	46	92	100 "
*St. John	79	152	99 "
Kingston and Vincent de Paul (1873)	506	1,066	110 "
Maine	174	206	18 " !!

This is sufficiently startling in itself, but is made still more so when we remember the fact that convicts in Maine are sent to State Prison for *one* year and upwards, whilst in Canadian Penitentiaries, *two* years is the minimum term of imprisonment.

Cities of Maine compared with cities of Ontario.

We give below a comparative statement of arrests for 1880 in Belleville, Hamilton, Bangor and Maine. The principal crimes are tabulated with the arrests under each, and the percentage of arrests in Hamilton and Belleville, over those in Bangor in proportion to the population :

	Hamilton.	Bangor.	Excess in arrests in Hamilton over Bangor.
Assaults	331	62	175 per cent.
Drunk	579	164	80 "
Drunk and disorderly	201	73	45 "
Disorderly	77	17	80 "
Vagrancy	172	1	8,500 "
Larceny	243	26	380 "
Fighting on streets	47	0	"
Lodgers	2420	433	200 "
Total arrests	2543	546	140 "

*NOTE—(Short term prisoners are included in the figures from St. John.)

	Belleville.	Bangor.	Excess of arrests in Belleville over Bangor.
Assaults	55	62	60 per cent.
Drunk	179	164	90 "
Drunk and disorderly	87	73	110 "
Disorderly	16	17	65 "
Vagrancy	38	1	"
Larceny	39	26	160 "
Fighting on streets	23	0	"
Lodgers	432	433	80 "
Total arrests	812	546	165 "

The population of Hamilton in 1880 was 35,000, of Belleville, about 10,000, and of Bangor, 18,000.

Next let us compare the arrests for Lewiston and Auburn (population 28,000) in Maine, with those of Hamilton, for the year 1880 :

Lewiston and Auburn.	Hamilton.	Per cent. of Hamilton arrests over those of Lewiston and Auburn, in proportion to population.
Total arrests	2,543	620 per cent. greater.
Arrests for drunk & disorderly 80	780	680 " "
Assaults	331	432 " "
Larceny	243	500 " "

Lewiston and Auburn has but one arrest for every 112 people, one drunk for every 400.
Hamilton do. do. 13 do. do. 45.

Hamilton has nine times the crime and drunkenness that Lewiston and Auburn has in proportion to population.

Let us next make a comparison of Bangor, Portland, Hamilton and Toronto, and see how criminality and expense of police stand, for the year 1880 :

	Bangor.	Portland.	Hamilton.	Toronto.
Population	18,000	36,000	35,000	90,000
Total arrests	546	2,213	2,543	5,939
Lodgers	433	1,157	2,420	
Police force	9	39	44	143
Cost of police per head	33 cents	83 cents	88 cents	$1 10
Arrests to number of inhabitants	1 to 33	1 to 16	1 to 13	1 to 15

From the above we learn that Bangor and Portland, the two largest cities in Maine, and where the Prohibitory Law has been least faithfully administered, stand far ahead of the larger Ontario cities in freedom from crime and pauperism, and in lessened cost of police.

MAINE COMPARED WITH LICENSE STATES.

A favourite assertion with anti-prohibitionists is that Maine, with all her prohibition, is no better off in respect to crime than her sister license States. Suppose we test this in the light of facts, taken from the Official Reports of Maine and Connecticut for 1880 :

Convicts in State Prison at the end of the year 1880.

	Conn.	Maine.
For murder	32	21
" manslaughter	5	5
" rape	13	9
" murderous assults	11	7
" robbery	5	4
" arson	3	7
" forgery	9	9
" burglary	58	4
" all other crimes	125	133
Total	261	199

	Conn.	Maine.
Commitments to jails	4142	2309
Sentenced to State Prison	134	60
Total prison population at end of year	837	414
Proportion of jail and prison pop. to pop. of State	1 to 740	1 to 1570
Proportion of commitals to jails to pop. of State	1 to 154	1 to 290

Bearing in mind that the population of Connecticut is about 26,000 less than of Maine, the facts brought out above present a very decided contrast to the glib assertion, so recklessly made, and warrant the statement that, taken all in all, Connecticut under license, with a less population than Maine under prohibition, has *more than twice the crime.*

The official reports of 1880 show the following prison population in the States named below, at the close of the year 1880, and the proportion to the population in each State :

	Conn.	Penn.	Mass.	Maine.
Total in prisons	837	4623	3821	414
Population to proportion	1 to 740	1 to 926	1 to 467	1 to 1570

By which it appears, taking the prison population at the end of the year that Connecticut has more than twice, Pennsylvania about one and three-quarters, and Massachusetts more than thrice the crime of Maine in proportion to population !

The following figures, taken from the Eleventh Annual Report of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics, show the

number of convicts in various State Prisons, and the average number of convicts to the population. An examination of the table will show that Maine has less crime than any State of the Union, with exception of Minnesota and Wisconsin.

State.	Convicts.	1 to each
Alabama.....	873	1400 people
California.....	1318	600 "
Connecticut....	278	2200 "
Florida.....	163	1600 "
Georgia.....	1239	1100 "
Illinois.....	1636	1800 "
Indiana.....	1231	1600 "
Iowa.....	698	2300 "
Maine.....	221	3000 "
Maryland.....	927	1000 "
Massachusetts..	757	2300 "
Minnesota.....	218	3500 people
New Hampshire	180	1900 "
New York	3488	1400 "
New Carolina..	495	2800 "
Ohio.....	1633	1900 "
Pennsylvania...	1764	2300 "
Rhode Island..	92	3000 "
South Carolina.	372	2600 "
Texas.....	1738	900 "
Vermont.....	176	1900 "
Wisconsin.....	346	3700 "

CHAPTER VIII.

VARIOUS OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

OBJECTIONS TO THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

1. *It is partial prohibition; I will support nothing but a general and complete Prohibitory Law.*

The person who declares as above is in the position of one who, because he cannot have a whole loaf, refuses to receive any. The Parliament was importuned to pass a Prohibitory Law for the Dominion. It refused to do so on the ground, that the country was not ready for it. "Show us that Canadians wish a Prohibitory Law," it said to us, "and in order that you may do this, here is an option measure to vote upon, and which will allow any county or city that wishes to protect itself from the traffic to do so." And it gave us the Canada Temperance Act. We shall get no advance until we show Parliament, by adopting this law in a majority of the constituencies of Canada, that the country's sentiment would support the general law. The great body of Temperance men accept this Act, and are content to work through it up to complete prohibition. If they were to throw away this and attempt the passage of a Prohibitory Law in Canada, they would have to fight the whole liquor interest united; now the contests divide that interest. Then the loss of nearly $5,000,000 yearly revenue, would have to be met. The brewers and distillers, whose property would be rendered useless, would cry for compensation, and all the objections on ground of interference with trade, individual rights, liberty of conscience, sumptuary laws, alleged failure of Prohibition, &c., &c., would be chanted in united chorus by the defenders of the traffic. There does not seem the slightest probability that if we give up this Act the Parliament will grant us Prohibition. The person who ties himself to the above objection, simply obstructs the gaining of that which he pro-

fesses to wish for, and refuses to help a part, because, forsooth, he cannot cure the whole.

The Act is sectional in its operation, and in this lies its recommendation. Any city or county, whose public sentiment is ready for it, can call it into force and reap its benefits. And although these benefits are not so great as would accrue, if the whole country were under Prohibition, yet they are definite and to be desired. The educating tendency in the agitation for this Act, which must be thoroughly discussed before it can be adopted, is of inestimable value. The good effects resulting from the enforcement of the law in one locality, affords the best arguments, from that experience, why it should be tried in others. County can be added to county, and so large areas covered by the operations of the Act. In this way the whole Province of Prince Edward Island, about three-fifths of New Brunswick, a considerable portion of Manitoba, and two-thirds of Nova Scotia, and various counties of Ontario, are being joined county by county, and so the country is marching on to complete Prohibition, without violently disturbing any great interest, and with the sufficient backing of majority sentiment in each municipality.

It is true that those who are determined to have liquor will go to outside cities and counties and get it; but it is equally true that thousands, who drink, do so just because the facilities for drinking are at hand, and these will neither go away for it, nor bring it from a distance to their homes. Thousands who know they are in danger, would hail with joy the putting away of daily temptation, who, so long as the Dram-shop is near them, will go deeper and deeper into drunkenness. And, above all, the schools of tippling—the street saloons, the bar of the hotel, the corner grocery, and the village tavern—are done away with, and the children of the community have a chance to grow up sober and free from the continual temptation. The law gives us power to purify our own communities, and protect our own homes; let us

gratefully avail ourselves of the privilege. Every county put under this Act renders a total Prohibitory Law easier of enactment.

2. *The Dunkin Act did not work well; our experience with that should prevent us voting for the Canada Temperance Act.*

This objection might be of some force provided the Dunkin Act and the Canada Temperance Act were exactly similar pieces of legislation. But they are not. They are as dissimilar as can well be. This will be seen by placing their principal provisions side by side.

The Dunkin Act.	*The Canada Temperance Act.*
1. Allowed any shop-keeper or trader to sell any kind of intoxicating liquors, to be consumed in the community where sold; the only restriction being that not less than five gallons or a dozen bottles should be sold at a time.	1. Allows no person to sell any intoxicating liquor by retail for beverage purposes in the county or city, and no person to sell by wholesale for consumption in the county or city or in any adjoining county or city under the Act. (The single exception to this is that a person who raises grapes and makes them into wine may sell such wine, but only at the place where he makes it, only in quantities over ten gallons, and not then until he is licensed to do so by the municipality.
2. The penalties were ridiculously small, and the same for each offence, viz: a fine not less than $20 nor greater than $50. There was no imprisonment, no advance in the penalty. The fine was no greater for the 100th offence than for the first.	2. The penalties are adequate—not less than $50 for the first offence—not less than $100 for the second offence—imprisonment for each subsequent offence.
3. The By-law could be repealed within a year from adoption, and this offered a premium to the Dram-sellers to persistently fight the law in order to make it unpopular, and so carry repeal and get their business back.	3. The law cannot be repealed inside three years from the time of its going into force. The inducements for fighting the law and rendering it unpopular so as to bring on a reaction and speedily repeal it are consequently taken away.
4. The constitutionality of the law was in constant dispute and this paralized the arm of enforcement.	4. The consitutionality of the law is settled beyond doubt by the Highest Court of Appeal in the Empire so that its execution will not be hampered by fears of *ultra vires*.

A careful perusal of the above will convince any reasonable man that the two Acts are not at all alike. In fact the Canada Temperance Act was enacted for the very purpose of overcoming the defects in the Dunkin Act. If we try to imagine each Act in operation in a city, we shall easily perceive the practical differences.

Under the Dunkin Act.—Every trader or shopkeeper can sell as much liquor as he pleases in quantities over five gallons, or one dozen bottles. He does not require any license therefor. The liquor can be drunk anywhere in the city. The penalties for violation are small. Every trader is allowed to keep liquors without license and so has a *basis of operations* from which he may violate the law and sell by the glass. No licenses being required, the places that sell may be 500, or 800: there is no restriction as to number. There are doubts as to the validity of the Act, and this retards conviction. Add to all this that a vote can be had in 12 months and the whole question again be brought up: so the sellers hold on in the hope of getting the legal dramshop back again.

What could you hope for in the way of great success from such an Act? It would indeed be a wonder if in a city it could be worked at all.

Under the Canada Temperance Act.

Under it no person can sell for beverage purposes by retail or wholesale for consumption in the city, or in counties or cities which adjoin and are under the Act. No license can be issued for such sale, and no person can sell without a license.

The basis of operations is taken away. The penalties are heavy. The convictions are summary before the Police Magistrate and final. There are no doubts as to the validity of the Act. There is no chance of getting a return vote for three years, and so present liquor-sellers go into some better business.

3. *If you adopt the Canada Temperance Act you will destroy the barley market.*

A little calm consideration will effectually dispose of this objection. The price of barley, as of any other product, is

fixed in the markets by the heavy buyers—that is, by the large general demand, and not by the lighter buyers, or limited special demand, The heavy buyers of barley are not our Canadian brewers. Canada put on the market in 1883, 11,140,737 bushels of barley. Of this, the brewers took only 1,003 904, and there remained about 10,136,833. What became of it? The Foreign market absorbed it all; for we find that there was exported in barley, 8,817,216 bushels, and in malt, 1,319,617 bushels; a total of 10,136,833 bushels of barley. So that the brewers bought less than one-eleventh of the farmers' barley in 1883. Now any one can see that the heavy buyers—the exporters—fix the price of barley, and that this price would not be in the least disturbed if the brewers were to refuse to buy any, for the exporters would quickly take it for the foreign market, and at the usual rates. It is absurd to say that the brewers, who purchase but *one* bushel in every *eleven* put upon the market, rule the market prices.

The following table shows the amount of malt used, its equivalent in bushels of barley and the malt liquor produced for home consumption for the years named:—

Year.	Barley Exported in Grain. Bush.	Barley Exported in Malt. Bush.	Barley used by Brewers. Bush.	Beer Made. Imp. Galls.
1868....	4,055,872....	28,478....	630,048....	6.194,738
1869....	4,630,069....	31,854....	608,754....	6,336,290
1870 ...	6,663,877....	154,809....	568,426....	6,075,451
1871....	4,832,997....	181,246....	658,535....	7,047,580
1872....	5,606,343....	243,494....	725,224....	7,964,441
1873....	4,346,923....	283,156....	841,938...	9,217,102
1874....	6,663,877....	174,773....	760,391....	8,976,268
1875....	5,419,054....	130,587....	796,805....	9,653,525
1876....	10,168,176....	281,204...	843,806....	9,319,190
1877....	6,345,697....	322,630....	777,230 ...	9,115,258
1878...	7,267,399....	532,461....	763,105....	8,578,075
1879 ...	5,383,922....	512,024.. .	699,453....	8,848,208
1880....	7,239,562....	1,032,733....	733,868.. .	9,201,213
1881....	8,811,278....	630,657....	788,777....	9,931,176
1882....	11,588,446....	1,124,159....	965,999.. .	12,036,979
1883....	8,817,216....	1,319,617....	1,003,904....	12,757,444
Total....	107,840,708....	6,983,882		

Average per year, 6,740,044.

From this it will appear that for the 16 years since Confederation the brewers have used 12,166,263 bushels of barley in all, or an average of 760,391 bushels per year, thus affording a market for less than $\frac{1}{10}$ of the barley put on the market in Canada. The hollowness of the cry that their trade is being injured will also appear when we see that their output for home consumption has raisen from 6,194,738 Imp. gals. in 1868 to 11,757,444 in 1883.

Again, the objector knows that the passage of the Act in any county or city does not shut up the brewery. The brewer goes on with his buying and brewing; only he must now seek a market elsewhere than inside the prohibited district. His sales will be diminished in the county or city which is under the Act, and to that extent, unless he can enlarge his outside business, he must brew, and so buy, less barley. But this amount will be but a very small fraction of the 800,000 bushels purchased by Canadian brewers, so that in no year will the 800,000 bushels be thrown back on the market. But each year, as the Act passes in county after county, the brewers will buy a little less barley, and this will be taken each year by the other purchasers in our market, and cause no appreciable difference in market quotations.

4. *You cannot make men sober by Act of Parliament.*

If this has any meaning as used against prohibitory legislation, it is this—that you cannot lessen intemperance by Act of Parliament. And this is precisely what no sensible man believes. We have to-day in Canada but one liquor-seller to every 500 people; liquors are not to be sold upon certain days, to certain classes of persons, and within certain hours. Who doubts that we have less drunkenness and more sobriety with the traffic thus restricted than we should have if all these restrictions were taken off, and free trade in liquor were allowed? In Canada, dramshops must be closed between seven o'clock on Saturday night and six o'clock on Monday morning. Have we not less drunkenness than if this prohibition were taken off, and all the bars were running

until midnight of each Saturday? Everybody sees that these restrictions, by lessening the places and hours of sale, prevent drunkenness and promote sobriety. And how do we get these restrictions? By Act of Parliament, and no other process. And if enacting a law that only *one* in *five hundred* shall open a tippling house, and that no sales shall be made after seven o'clock on Saturday nights, decreases drunkenness and so adds to the general sobriety, why should not an Act of Parliament providing that only one person in 5,000 open a tippling shop add still more to the aggregate temperance of the country? And if evil results still continued, why should not a further Act of Parliament forbid any person setting up a public-place in which to turn his sober neighbours into tipplers and drunkards?

The simple fact is that *drunkenness will be in proportion to the facilities provided for drinking, and the respectability which surrounds these.* Have as many drinking-places as possible, and have them upheld by the respectable sentiment of the community, and you will have the maximum of drunkenness. Have as few drinking-places as possible, and have these as disrespectable as possible, and you will have the minimum of drunkenness and drunkard-making. A drinking place will be respectable so long as the community authorizes and protects it by its laws. If we will make it as disreputable as possible, we must put it under the ban of popular sentiment, and under the condemnation of the highest expression of this sentiment—the statutes of the country.

But there is no point to the above objection, as used against the Canada Temperance Act, for this Act does not deal with the *man who drinks*, but with the *man who sells*. And will any one say that, by an Act of Parliament, a person cannot be prevented from selling liquor? Our present license laws keep 499 persons out of every *five hundred* from selling drink; this Act simply proposes to apply the same rule to the five hundredth person that is now applied to the 499, and surely if an "Act of Parliament" can effectively

prohibit 499 from an act of sale, it should not find much difficulty in managing the remaining *one*.

The country looks out upon this public sale of alcoholic liquors, from which results 70 per cent. of the crime, 60 per cent. of the pauperism, 20 per cent. of the insanity, and a large proportion of the disease, waste, misery and death which afflicts it; and the country says, "I have a right to protect myself, even though it diminishes the gains, and crosses the appetites of a few. I will henceforth allow no person to sell this most destructive beverage. I will prevent this preventible crime, poverty and disease, which so burden and weaken me." Who shall deny that the country has this right, that it is abundantly able to maintain it, or that it would immeasurably conduce to the sobriety, prosperity and happiness of the people, if this right were exercised? And if the gains of men who live by producing and selling this destructive agent, or the tastes of persons who have made it an artificial necessity to them, are interfered with, who shall say that these should outweigh the good of the greater number and perpetuate this terrible evil?

A prohibitory law, fairly enforced, can do five things:—

(*a*) It can pronounce the verdict of the country's disapproval upon a ruinous and baneful traffic, and thus brand it with public disgrace.

(*b*) It can relieve the country of the sin and responsibility of turning its sober children into drunkards by virtue of an Act of Parliament, and for a money consideration.

(*c*) It can put away all public temptations to drinking and drunkenness, and thus make it as easy as possible for all to grow up into sober and honorable citzenship.

(*d*) It can prevent men, whom no moral considerations seem to influence, from making it their sole business to induce their fellows to tipple and drink, so as thereby to live upon their degradation and ruin.

(*e*) It can elevate law into righteousness, and thus make it a continual teacher and supporter of sobriety and justice.

5. *It is tyrannical and un-British.*

It is not tyrannical or un-British to look after and preserve the "good of the greater number," even though the gains or appetites of the few be interfered with. The Canada Temperance Act interferes with the traffic of the liquor-sellers and makers, but it does this in order to protect the lives, the material interests and the moral well-being of the people. Which would be the greater tyranny, that the few thousands of makers and sellers of alcoholic liquors in Canada should be deprived of this particular way of making money, in order that the real interests of the millions of the people be conserved, or that the interests of those millions should be sacrificed to the gain and greed of the few thousands? A man wishes to run a factory, keep cattle byres, build a slaughter house, or sell obscene literature in the very centre of a crowded city. He can make money out of it, do a business, employ labour, and get great gain thereby.

But the people object. Personal comfort, security, health and morals are endangered; and the man who wished to carry on the profitable business, and the persons who wanted him conveniently near to deal with, must both bow to the best interests of the people. The obnoxious business is prohibited, and yet we are supposed to be a free people, and to be doing nothing un-British. A man cannot build a house to his own liking, on a lot owned by himself, within the fire limits of a city; he must build it fire-proof or not at all. One cannot shoot game birds when he likes, or pile his garbage in his own back yard, nor store combustibles where he pleases, nor keep pigs and cows in his own barn in a city, &c., &c. He is hedged in by a thousand restrictions, the basis of which is that the general good and comfort must be looked to as well as his individual convenience and gain.

So, when the people come to the conclusion that the open saloon, which robs home of dear ones, turns sobriety into revel, order into riot, plenty into poverty, and manhood

into worse than beastliness, ought not, in the general interests of society, to be continued, the man who runs it and the tipplers who want it must both give way before the general good. It is not tyranny or something un-British. It is the height of freedom, and an exalted exercise of the grand principles of British equity, thus to protect that which is dearest and best to the many against the greed or the appetites of the few.

The Act does not say to any man, "You shall drink thus and so." It goes to the public seller and bids him stop endangering the many in order to gather gain for himself, and it says to the drinker, "Alcoholic liquors are not a necessary of life; at best they are but a doubtful luxury; you will lose nothing by being without them; but if you think you must have them, get them the best way you can. I shall not allow them to be sold under my auspices, for their sale is productive of vast injury to the country."

The Act takes no *right* from the present seller. He has paid for the liberty of selling liquors for one year. He has received license to sell for one year. There is nothing that assures him that the contract will be renewed. He gets what he has paid for. When the Act is adopted, the people—the other party to the contract—advise him that no more contracts will be made, and that he must look for a job elsewhere. He went into the business from year to year for the sake of the gains: he pocketed the gains, and if the refusal to renew the contract, on the part of the people, occasions him any loss, he must simply pocket that as well. Surely there is nothing tyrannical in this.

The Act is not a sumptuary law. It does not tell people what clothes they shall wear, how much meat they shall eat, what jewellery they shall display, and the kinds and price of the furniture they shall have as did sumptuary laws, which dealt solely with the expenses of the people and were directed against extravagance. This law does not touch the habits, expenses, wardrobe or table of the individual. It simply

has to do with a public act—the sale of liquors—and prohibits those who, utterly careless as to what harm may come to others, wish to pursue a calling which, for the least possible outlay of money or brains, will bring them in the easiest competence.

Is it tyrannical or un-British ?

"No," said the British Parliament, in 1854, when it applied the Forbes McKenzie Act to Scotland, and thereafter prohibited the sale of intoxicating liquors for one day out of every seven.

"No," said the same Parliament when, in 1878, it enacted the Irish Sunday Closing Act, and placed the whole island, with the exception of five of its largest cities, under its operation. And it reiterated that opinion when, in 1881, it closed up the dram-shops in Wales on the Sabbath day, and, in 1884, extended the Sunday Closing Act to the five Irish cities previously exempted.

"No," it repeatedly declared, when in the British House of Commons a resolution embodying the right of the ratepayers of a district to say whether and how many drinking places should be opened in its borders was passed in 1880 by a majority of 26, in 1881 by a majority of 45, and in 1883 by a majority of 87.

Legislatures, people, and judicial courts in the United States have over and over again said that prohibitory power was both right and expedient. Maine so declared when her legislature passed the prohibitory law of 1851, re-enacted it in 1858, and maintained it in increasing efficiency to this time. Vermont and New Hampshire have so declared by the enactment of prohibitory laws in 1852, and by preserving them in force and effect.

Kansas, by popular vote, in 1882, made a similar declaration, and was followed by Iowa in 1882, with a popular majority of 30,000. There is scarcely a State in the Union which has not by statute enactment exploded this objection, and there is no instance on record where the highest

judicial authority has not upheld the principle of the right and expediency of such legislation.

Canada, too, by the Dunkin Act, by the North-West Territory Prohibitory Act and the Canada Temperance Option Act has set her authority behind the principle of Prohibition partial and absolute.

This bug-bear of "tyrannical and un-British" is a mere catch-cry which can only have the effect with ignorant and the interested.

To say that a man is a "slave" and no "British free man" who stands up for his children, his home and his country against the demoralization of the grog-shop!

To say that a man demonstrates his "independence" and "love of liberty" as he bends beneath the weight of the dram-shop and bears it up on his sturdy shoulders—while above him brewers, distillers and liquor-sellers ply the whip of temptation, tighten the reins of appetite, and, as they lighten the "freeman's" pockets, drive him on to his ruin!!

To endeavor to teach men that the dram-shop is the true palladium of their liberties, that "King Cup" is an easier ruler than "Queen Temperance," that the black-bottle and greatness go together, and that the "Trade" is the only genuine defender of the rights of man!!!

Do such teachers suppose that all the good sense has left Canadian people?

6. *It will ruin the country.*

Let us ask this objector to give us a "bill of particulars," as to just what will be ruined if the Act passes, and the dram-shops are closed up.

(*a*) Will the laborer be ruined? Nay, the dramshop gives no tools for better work, no strength to the arm, no steadiness to the purpose, no noble ambition. If the dram-shop gets a hold on the laborer it steals his earnings, breaks down his energy, palsies his strong arm, unsettles his brain, makes his home miserable, and ends, if possible, in ruining him.

In 1834, a committee of the House of Commons, presided over by Mr. Buckingham, declared that :—

"The loss of productive labor in every department of occupation, to the extent of at least one day in six throughout the kingdom (as testified by witnesses engaged in various manufacturing operations), by which the wealth of the country, created as it is chiefly by labor, is retarded or suppressed to the extent of one million out of every six that is produced ; to say nothing of the constant derangement, imperfection and destruction in every agricultural and manufacturing process, occasioned by the intemperance, and consequent unskilfulness, inattention and neglect of those affected by intoxication, producing great injury in our domestic and foreign trade."

Shut up all the dramshops and the labouring power of the country will be immediately aided.

(*b*) Will the manufacturers be injured? No, the liquor shops supply these with no material for use, no implements for making, no impulse or device for aiding. On the contrary, they sell what takes workmen from their places, causes loss of time, waste of power, and confusion in business. If you ask the stove makers, the cotton makers, the furniture makers, the sewing machine makers—all makers else—except *tobacco and liquor makers*, they will tell you "*The dramshop does not help our business ; close the dramshop and give us the increased savings in the homes and our trade will certainly increase.*"

(*c*) Will the merchants be injured? No, the saloons are the enemies of these. They do not add to the clear steadiness of employer or clerk. They do not make the business man more trustworthy or popular. They do not increase the demand for goods. Ask the merchants, and if they are honest, they will tell you : "*The saloons are against us. Money which ought to go to clothe the family is squandered therein. The sober man is my best customer. Close the dramshops and give increased sobriety and thrift, and our business would surely increase.*"

(*d*) Will the Home be injured? The question answers itself. If the saloons could be shut, what a flood of light and joy would sweep into the homes of Canada, chasing out

the evil spirits of neglect, discord and revel which the saloon has introduced into many of them, lighting up the wan face of Despair with the warm rays of Hope, bidding Plenty enter across the threshold where Poverty had long crouched, and touching anew the chords of Love's harp, so long covered with the dust of sensuality and hate. Ah no! the homes would not weep if the saloons were closed.

(*e*) Will Society, the School or the Church be injured? No. But all these would rejoice if this, their persistent plague, could be swept away. Not one element of social purity, not one impulse to intellectual endeavor, not one aspiration towards Heaven and God come from the liquor-shop. But as its doors shut and open, open and shut, disorder, crime, filth, apathy of intellect, tendencies to idleness, germs of immorality and temptations to sin do constantly pour forth upon society, school and church. These help to lift man upward; the saloon continually pulls down and degrades.

What will be injured then? Whose business will be interfered with?

(*a*) The liquor maker's business. He could destroy less good grain—man's food—and turn it into a poisonous, harmful beverage, which as it circulates through the saloons brings to *him money;* to others, *poverty, sadness and ruin.*

(*b*) The liquor seller's business. He could no longer lazily stand behind his bar waiting for men to earn their little store by honest labor, and then give it to him for DRINK.

(*c*) The man who lets places for selling. He may have to take a little less per year for the place he now lets for selling liquor—a few dollars less per month. One would think that the consciousness of having a clean, honest business carried on in his building would be compensation enough for that. Then if he saw a poor sot reeling home, he would not have to think, "That stuff which is ruining that man is sold in my building. I get money for giving a place in which such work is done."

So that we have the whole matter in a nut shell.

THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC

HELPS		INJURES
The Brewer and Distiller,		The Manufacturer,
The Saloon Keeper,		The Dry Goods Man,
The Saloon Lessor		The Grocer,
to fill their pockets ;		The Bookseller,
		The Picture Maker,
		The Butcher,
	and	The Milkman,
		The Laborer, &c.,
		The School,
		The Church,
The sober man to		The Home,
become a drunkard.		The Country.

Let us ponder whether we shall keep the Liquor Traffic for the sake of **THREE UNPRODUCTIVE INTERESTS**, or shut up the Saloon for the sake of all these **PRODUCTIVE AND BENEFICIAL INTERESTS.**

7. *You will lose the Revenue and increase the Taxes.*

Who pays the license revenue? The liquor sellers, says our objector. Where do the liquor sellers get it? Out of the pockets of the people. And if the people refused to patronize their bars, the liquor sellers would starve, or else have to do honest work for a living, as do other people. So the people have to pay into the liquor seller's till the amount he gives to the treasury, *plus* the amount necessary for the keep and enriching of the liquor seller and his family. What do the people get for it? Shoes, blankets, flour, meat, clothing? No. They get whiskey, beer, rum and the like, which not only gives them no strength, no warmth and no food, but makes many of them foolish, dissipated, idle and drunken, and adds in every way to their general burdens. Suppose that in a certain city thereare thirty liquor sellers, and that they pay $100 each for license, a sum equal to $3,000. This goes into the city treasury. But *it comes out of the pockets of the people.* Suppose each of these liquor sellers takes in over his bar $2,000 per year. That is a total of $60,000. Where

does this come from? *Out of the pockets of the people.* So that the people actually pay not only the $3,000 which the sellers hand over to the treasury, but $57,000 in addition, which the sellers put into their own pockets. How infinitely better it would have been if the people had paid the $3,000 tax directly, and kept the $57,000 in their own pockets. The liquor sellers were simply taxgatherers, who took $60,000 from the taxpayers, gave over one-twentieth of the amount to the people's treasury, and kept the nineteen-twentieths to themselves.

But this is not the end of it. $3,000 for licenses and $57,000 for keep is not all.

(*a*) These thirty places must be watched, else they would sell to minors and ruin the children of tender age. They would keep open after hours, and allow men to booze away their nights in dissipation. They would sell all Sunday, and so turn the Day of Rest into a day of drunken debauchery. They would allow idle and dissolute characters to loaf about their bars and make constant disturbance.

So the ratepayers must put their hands in their pockets and pay for license inspectors, police and constables to watch the thirty saloons and keep them to the law.

(*b*) The helplessness caused by these places must be looked after.—One of the first results of the saloon is drunkenness. Men go into it sober and able to take care of themselves; they come out drunken and helpless. So the police cells must be ready, the jails must be kept up, the courts must be paid, and the expenses incurred for taking care of and feeding this helplessness. Who pays for this? The people—the ratepayers.

(*c*) The crime manufactured by these saloons must be cared for.—Does any one deny that crime is nursed and fostered in these haunts? Liquor depraves men and makes them regardless of the property and rights of others; it pauperizes men, and brings them to living upon honest earners; it frenzies men and leads them to the commission of crimes,

which in their sober moments they would never dream of. In Hamilton in 1880 there were 2,545 arrests made by the police—*one in every thirteen persons!* In Toronto there were 5,935 arrests—*one to every fifteen inhabitants!* Ontario had in 1880 11,300 committals to jail. Fully 70 per cent. of all these were the product of the dram-shop; and the cost of all this is something enormous. Who takes care of and pays for the crime manufactured by the saloons? The people —the ratepayers.

(*d*) The poverty caused by the saloons must be cared for.—Does any one deny that a great deal of pauperism comes from drinking? When a man becomes drunken and is sent away for six months to the prison, what must be done with his wife and children? They must be supported. When the bread winner is suddenly killed in a drunken brawl or accident, the survivors must be fed and clothed.

What is the primary school and graduating institution of the tramp? The saloon. There four-fifths of them squandered their former earnings, there they learned their vicious, idle habits, and there they spend the most of what they beg from kind-hearted people.

And so in a thousand ways private and city charities are invoked, and the honest earner must give a portion of his earnings to make good the destruction from the saloon.

(*e*) The drain on manhood must be borne.—A man loses a horse, and suffers damage to the extent of a hundred dollars in value. A house is burned, and a thousand dollars has gone up in smoke. These are losses which tax the industry, and hinder the prosperity of a community.

How is it when young men are cut off in their prime by drink; when boys are turned into idle and dissolute vagabonds; when bread-winners become destroyers, and earners are changed into paupers? Is all this no loss to a community? A healthy laboring man will easily earn and spend $500 per year for a period of thirty years. That makes an aggregate of $15,000 earned in a lifetime and distributed

among the industries and trades. Cut him off by drink at 25 years of age, and the community loses an earning power of $15,000. Demoralize and make him criminal, and you must add to that loss the burden of cost that is saddled upon the community by his criminality. Now sum it all up and see how it stands:

WHAT THE PEOPLE PAY FOR.	WHAT THE SALOON KEEPER PAYS FOR
The License Fee of the Saloons.	Nothing !
The Keep of the Saloons.	
The Watching of the Saloons.	
The Helplessness, The Crime The Poverty The Destruction — Caused by the Saloons.	

WHAT THE PEOPLE RECEIVE.	WHAT THE SALOON KEEPER RECEIVES.
Worse than Nothing (Alcoholic Liquors.)	The Hard Earnings of the People.

CHAPTER IX.

OBJECTIONS.

8. *Moral Suasion is sufficient: you must not take Temperance into Politics.*

"Moral suasion sufficient!" Then why do we in this country have laws which prohibit 499 persons in every 500 from selling intoxicants? Why do we enact that all bars shall be closed on Sundays, on election days, after certain hours, and that liquor shall not be sold to habitual drunkards, to minors and to Indians? If moral suasion *is sufficient*, why should not all civilized nations rely on it, instead of continually having recourse to more and more stringent laws?

The fact is that no Christian Government can be found which has not proceeded on the assumption that moral suasion *is insufficient*, and must be supplemented by the strong arm of the law. Every sensible man believes that legal restrictions are necessary, and the only question is as to the length to which these shall be carried. And it is evident to thoughtful minds that, if the extra legal restraints now thrown about the traffic—such as no sale on Sunday, on Saturday nights, on election days, to minors, or Indians, or drunkards, and by but one person in 500—have exerted a vast deal of beneficial influence in repressing the evils of intemperance, but have not by any means eradicated them, then what is needed is still further restriction, and more and more, until the evils either entirely disappear or are reduced to the merest minimum. Every restriction is an arm which aids moral suasion the better to do, and to preserve the results of its work.

"Not take temperance into politics!" Why, the dramshop is grounded on, and wrapped about with the protection

of politics. No man can open a dramshop and make his neighbor drunken, unless he does it by law—by Act of Parliament—through politics. The statutes prescribe just what conditions are necessary, the men to whom licenses are to be granted, and the number of licenses that shall be issued. How does our objector hope to get rid of the dramshop, unless temperance is taken into politics, concentrated into votes, and crystallized in enactments which shall forbid that nuisance? We worship to-day with perfect freedom, we think without fear, and live in security of life and property, just because our ancestors took their religion, their principles, and their purity into politics, and, often through seas of blood, carried them up to their firm resting place in constitution and law. The Sabbath, the Bible, the church and the school, are all guarded by the sacred sentries of law—guarded from the minority whom moral suasion does not affect, and who, but for the sentries of the law, would desecrate the Sabbath, and bring scandal upon the very name of Christianity. Virtue, reputation, property and life are all protected by the merciful mastership of the law; not because moral suasion is insufficient to convince moral people that these should be preserved inviolate, but simply to guard them from the unholy hands of the few who, caring nothing for right or truth, would, for selfish purposes, traffic in and destroy these sacred possessions of humanity. What gives the right of interference to the sentries of the law? The suffrages of the people—acting through political organizations. Raise public opinion as high as possible on the temperance question, and there will still remain wretches so void of all respect for the wishes of the good and the best interests of their fellows, as to eagerly and persistently trade on the appetites which they create, and live from the degradation which they cause. What care they for moral suasion? They must be *driven out*, and the law alone can do this. This law is a creature of the people, and an outcome of their votes. And temperance must be taken into politics before the last dramshop disappears, and the last dramseller ceases his ruinous work. Reader,

the only way you can crystallize your temperance convictions is to write them on ballot papers, and weave them into the public life and legislation of the country.

9. *You should not adopt the Canada Temperance Act without compensating the men at present engaged in the traffic.*

Is it meant by this that the county or city should compensate the brewers and distillers? Surely not. If there is to be any compensation, it must come from those who have been receiving-partners in the profits. The county or city has received no part in the profits; the Dominion has. It has taken its two or three millions of dollars annually from brewers and distillers, and has been doing this all these years. So it is to the Dominion Government that this claim should be preferred. And yet we find that, in 1878, the Parliament, passing a bill introduced by the Government, made it possible for every part of Canada to outlaw the sale of liquors, and never once raised the question of compensation. The brewer and distiller should have made good their claim then. They certainly have no right to compensation from the county or city ratepayers, who enjoy no part of their profits.

But the Act does not destroy the brewery or distillery. It leaves it intact—free to buy grain, spoil it, and make poisonous compounds as before, and then sell them wherever a market can be found. The people of a county, by adopting the Act, merely advise the brewer or distiller that they do not intend to trade with him, and request him no longer to thrust his wares upon them. And then, because the people refuse to trade with him, the brewer demands compensation! The Act leaves the brewery and distillery just as they were, as far as manufacturing is concerned; it merely gives notice that hereafter its territory is reserved.

If the Act shut up the brewery, it would be quite different. It simply necessitates a slight change of market, and the brewer and distiller may feel thankful to have escaped so easily. The next time the people of Canada demand a law,

it will be one that levels every factory for the making of this terrible mischief-producer. But, perhaps, the dealer is to be compensated. Is he a hotel-keeper? Then the Act does not touch his hotel. Every room is left entire, no dish is disturbed, the stable is not interfered with, and no person will, after the Act passes, be any more able to do without lodging, food, or stabling. The hotel and its legitimate business is not injured by the Act, and so no compensation is due on that score. The Act touches the bar—closes up the dramshop in the hotel—that is all. How long has this hotel-keeper the privilege of running a bar? Read his license, and you will find that he has bought the right to sell liquors *until the end of the year.* Does the Act take this from him? Not at all. The Act cannot go into force until his license has run out. So that he gets all he has paid for —the privilege of selling until expiry of license; and the adoption of the Act merely advises him not to expect a renewal. When the year is up, what has he to be compensated for? A bar room? That is not destroyed, but will easily make a good sitting-room, or show-room, or bedroom. A stock of liquors? No, for he has unloaded all his stock. What has he, then? A few demijohns, a beer pump and some empty casks. That comprises his whole actual loss. And yet he talks of compensation!

But, says the dramseller, you have taken from me the privilege of making money by another year's traffic. True, but society never compensates a man for what he *might make*, but *only for his actual loss.* Else the country would have to be continually compensating. Here are 500 men in a county who are equally qualified to sell liquors. Fifty of them get licenses, and then the number is full. The remaining 450 men come up and demand license. They are refused. They ask for compensation, but it is denied them on the ground that they have not *actually lost anything.* "True," say they, "but we might each make $1,000 if you would grant us the licenses. We demand compensation for what

we *might make*, but which you deny us the right to make." And their claim is just as righteous as is that of the dram-seller, who is refused license for another year because the Act has been adopted.

But, says another, he has fitted up a place for that sort of business. So he has, but he did so under no guarantee that he would receive a license for a longer time than one year. He knew the uncertainty of his traffic, he chose to take the risks for the sake of the profits; now let him pocket the losses, if there are any.

The Ontario Government by the passing of the Crooks' Act, cut off at one stroke nearly 2,000 licenses. Did we hear any talk of compensation? The British Government, in 1854, cut off one-seventh of the trade of the liquor sellers in Scotland; in 1878, the same was done in Ireland, and in 1881, in Wales. Was there any provision made for compensation? Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Kansas, and Iowa have passed, and kept absolute, prohibitory laws: they made no compensation. Local Option rules in large areas of country in the United States, yet in no single instance has compensation been given. Always people have taken the sensible view that this is a simple business matter. There were great profits in the traffic; there were also great risks. Persons took the risks and made the profits; when losses came they simply had to pocket them.

But stronger than all is the wide-spread feeling that, if there be compensation, it should be made *by the traffickers to the people*, and not by the people to the traffickers. Who have paid for the crime, the poverty, the insanity, and the viciousness laid upon the country, while the liquor-makers and sellers were heaping up their gains? Who have borne the worse than death—the estrangement—the separations—the hates—the cruelty—the neglect—the bitter misery, which overflowed so many homes, while these men were gathering their hoards? Where are the fathers, brothers, sons, hus-

bands, mothers and wives—once so brave, and true, and loving, but whose lives have gone out in utter darkness, because, forsooth, these men must grow rich ? Let the traffic pay society for the burdens it has laid on her shoulders, and then refused to touch so much even as with the tips of its fingers. Let it replace the virtue, the love, the happiness and health, of which it has robbed so many men. Let it call back from their cheerless, nameless graves the countless drunkards it has made, and restore them, pure as it found them, to the arms of their friends. Let it bind up the broken hearts, kindle the dead hopes, call back the vanished faces, and mend the broken home circles for whose ruin it has been responsible.

Then, and not till then, shall people who love justice, and prize fair dealing, consent to made compensation to so great an iniquity.

10. *The Right of Search Clause is tyrannical, and no home will be safe from the persecutions of the fanatics.*

The right of search clause is an admitted method and practice of British and Canadian law. Without it the ends of justice would be defeated on all sides. Stolen goods could not be recovered, smuggled wares could not be traced, nor contraband articles be retaken. Every efficient liquor law has its right of search clause. That of the Canada Temperance Act is more carefully guarded than that of the Ontario Crooks' Act, or, indeed, of most license laws.

(*a*) No warrant can be issued except to search for liquors *with respect to which an offence has been committed, and is at the time of the issue being prosecuted before the court.* B is charged with selling liquor contrary to law, and is on trial. It is reasonably suspected that the liquors thus illegally sold are stored in a certain place. A warrant may be issued to search for and bring those liquors before the court. In no other case can a search-warrant be properly issued.

(*b*) The warrant cannot be issued except by a court cognizant of the offence and prosecution. A *credible witness* has

to prove *on oath*, before such court, that there is reasonable cause to suspect that intoxicating liquor in respect to which the offence has been committed is stored in some person's house, shop, yard, or other place. The matter, even then, is in the hands of the court, who may, if not satisfied, withhold the warrant.

(*c*) No officer, constable or other person has any right to search for liquors unless he has previously obtained a warrant as described above.

Now compare this with the Crooks Act. In that, any officer, policeman, constable or inspector of license has the right to, at any time, and without *warrant*, enter and search any house, shop or place where liquors are sold or reputed to be sold. Any justice of the peace or police magistrate may, upon oath of any officer, policeman, constable or inspector of license, grant a warrant to search for liquors supposed to be there unlawfully, and when found there, these may be seized and removed.

Surely no person can complain that the right of search in the Canada Temperance Act is not most carefully guarded, or deny that quite as arbitrary power is at present conferred under our license laws. The Act has been enforced in the Maritime Provinces, in some places for five years, and there has not been a single instance of the abuse of the search clause.

CHAPTER X.

WHAT CANADA WASTES IN DRINK.

Few people stop to consider the enormous waste resulting from the manufacture and consumption of intoxicating liquors in our young country. The process of manufacture takes upon itself the semblance of an industry, and thus deludes people into the belief that there must be some advantage in it both as regards the employment of labor and the purchase of raw material. The process of distribution also maintains the appearance of exchange and business, and in this way cheats the casual observer into the belief that it possesses the healthy and stimulating virtues of legitimate and profitable trade. The ultimate effects of drink, both in its degradation and destruction of those who use it, and in the resultant cost of pauperism and crime to the community and the state, are largely lost sight of in the multitudinous detail in which they are distributed and observed.

And yet it is true that, in an economical sense, the traffic is utterly devoid of any favorable points, and is from first to last wasteful, destructive and impoverishing. Let us consider it in some of its various aspects.

1. *The Waste of Raw Material involved.*

The grain used in distilling is chiefly corn, with some rye, and weighs 56 lbs. to the bushel. One hundred pounds of barley will make 75 lbs. of malt, and barley is rated at 48 lbs. to the bushel.

The following is a tabular statement, taken from official returns of the grain and other material used in the manu-

facture of spirits and malt liquors taken for consumption in Canada, from 1868 to 1882, inclusive :—

Years.	FOR THE MANUFACTURE OF SPIRITS.			FOR THE MANUFACTURE OF BEER.	
	Grain used.	Molasses.	Sugar, &c.	Malt used.	Sugar & other substances.
1	3	4	5	10	11
	Lbs.	Gallons.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.
1868	67,685,511	....	.....	22,681,749	380,787
1869	62,359,505	1,085	.....	21,915,137	174,449
1870	58,901,557	12,364	.....	20,463,338	147,352
1871	86,788,405	23,609	.....	23,707,258	21,654
1872	79,324,558	16,042	2,006,050	26,108,073	285,328 B'sh corn 349
1873	91,452,558	.....	5,502	30,309,789	282,375 B'sh corn 343
1874	87,539,173	4,520	162,398	28,685,003	194,761 Corn 12,600
1875	90,094,381	8,642	14,992	30,377,039	215,004
1876	59,472,129	....	.....	27,980,256	68,560
1877	68,498,295	.....	.....	27,471,797	.....
1878	67,594,902	.....	.....	25,180,327	89
1879	66,749,856	.....	.....	25,456,803	2,410
1880	53,394,258	8,201	2,413	26,419,244	450
1881	53,667,108	502	9,674	28,395,987	.....
1882	70,402,810	.....	.....	34,775,986	.....
	1,063,925,006	74,965	2,201,029	399,927,788	1,785,819 B'sh corn 692

In the fifteen years included in the above table we have, therefore, used in Canada 18,998,410 bushels of corn and rye; 11,109,105 bushels of barley; 3,986,848 lbs. of sugar, and 74,965 gallons of molasses, or an average per year of 2,007,167 bushels of grain, 265,790 lbs. of sugar, and 4,997 gallons of molasses.

2. *The waste of Wealth involved. Cost for* 1883.

The following table shows the cost to the consumers of

liquors, malt and distilled, taken for use in Canada in the calendar year 1883 :—

Spirits (Canadian).....	3,766,586	galls. at	$5 00....	$18,832,930
Spirits (Imported).....	1,004,075	" "	6 00....	6,024,450
Beer (Canadian).....	13,178,820	" "	60....	7,907,292
Beer (Imported).....	395,352	" "	3 00....	1,186,056
Wines (Imported).....	563,778	" "	5 00....	2,818,890
Total.....	18,908,611	galls.		$36,769,618

The people of Canada, therefore, consumed in the calendar year of 1883, 18,908,611 gallons of intoxicating liquors, at a total cost of $36,769,618. The consumption per head was four and one-fifth gallons, and the cost per head a little over eight dollars.

Let us next consider the quantity of intoxicating liquors taken for use in Canada since Confederation, and its cost.

(*a*) The quantity used in fifteen years.

TABLE SHOWING THE QUANTITY OF LIQUORS USED FOR CONSUMPTION IN CANADA, FROM 1868 TO 1882, INCLUSIVE.

	SPIRITS.		BEER.		WINES.
YEAR.	CANADIAN.	IMPORTED.	CANADIAN.	IMPORTED.	
	Imp. Galls.	Imp. Galls.	Imp. Galls.	Imp. Galls.	Imp. Galls.
1868	3,203,830	1,290,654	6,194,738	199,704	488,098
1869	2,341,251	848,008	6,336,290	200,926	411,089
1870	3,175,857	941,479	6,075,451	188,024	562,441
1871	3,516,042	1,084,191	7,047,580	254,514	599,741
1872	3,808,292	1,320,915	7,964,441	304,734	780,820
1873	3,732,844	1,375,090	9,217,102	369,393	730,890
1874	4,566,509	1,555,907	8,976,268	415,651	890,922
1875	3,303,302	1,086,643	9,653,525	390,636	473,316
1876	3,441,125	1,251,848	9,319,190	320,234	689,304
1877	2,942,338	921,916	9,115,258	168,852	401,646
1878	3,007,870	826,046	8,578,075	294,651	382,793
1879	3,646,255	923,122	8,848,208	250,889	421,047
1880	2,290,366	636,641	9,201,213	193,266	317,421
1881	3,214,541	801,054	9,931,176	214,887	458,302
1882	3,552,818	891,467	12,036,979	248,491	553,826
	49,743,240	15,754,981	128,495,494	4,014,746	8,162,656
Total.....	65,498,221		132,510,240		8,162,656
An average per year of	4,366,537		8,834,010		560,645

Or of all intoxicating liquors, 13,765,208 gallons per year.

COST FOR FIFTEEN YEARS.

Spirits (Canadian).....	49,743,240	galls. at	$5 00....	$248,716,200
Spirits (Imported).....	15,754,981	" "	6 00....	94,529,886
Beer (Canadian).....	128,495.494	" "	60....	77,097,296
Beer (Imported).....	4,014,745	" "	3 00....	12,044,238
Wines (Imported).....	8,162,656	" "	5 00....	40,813,280
Total for 15 years...	206,171,117	galls.		$473,200,900
Average per year...	13,744,741	"		31,546,726

The following is a tabular statement of the duties derived from intoxicating liquors in Canada.

YEAR.	Duty Collected on Spirits Manufactured in Canada.	Duty Collected on Imported Liquors.	Duties in Malt and Malt Liquors, including License Fees.
1868	$2,309,592	$1,307,403 73	297,330
1869	1,769,971	970,592 13	274,908
1870	2,400,886	1,099,700 99	261,891
1871	2,658,274	1,257,164 58	301,890
1872	2,879,067	1,580,186 57	330,688
1873	2,820,641	1,582,142 39	368.110
1874	3,498,989	1,922,349 02	366,963
1875	2,972,972	1,629,346 11	365,029
1876	3,097,018	1,895,157 06	334,117
1877	2,648,101	1,356,884 05	388,892
1878	2,707,085	1,244,289 95	529,282
1879	3,295,880	1,395,098 07	450,300
1880	2,290,309	1,444,416 39	260,747
1881	3,228,608	1,656,718 57	295,130
1882	3,552,990	1,661,900 52	385,900
	42,130,423	22,003,350 23	5,211,067

The total duty collected during the fifteen years amounts to $69,344,840, or a yearly average of $4,922,989.

One can scarcely grasp the awful significance of the above figures. The immense quantities of grain that have been worse than wasted would have fed millions of people. The cost of liquors for one year exceeds the whole revenue of the Dominion of Canada. The cost per head has been fully twice as much as the total cost per head of all our customs dues since Confederation. The total amount spent in the fifteen years above tabulated, aggregates, without count-

ing interest, nearly $500,000,000. This would have defrayed all our cost of government, built our railways and left us without a shadow of a national debt. To all this we must add the incalculable cost of citizens slain, labour destroyed, pauperism borne and crime watched, restrained and punished. The wonder is, that, with such terrible waste, our country enjoys any prosperity. If this waste could be made to cease, Canada, in ten years, would not know herself, so prosperous and wealthy would she have grown. Surely it is the part of all good citizens to see to it that such a frightful source of waste and destruction is dried up. Prohibition is the only effectual cure.

CHAPTER XI.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

1. Q. Do the brewers of Canada use 2,600,000 bushels of barley per year, as certain rum-advocates have publicly stated?

A. From 1868 to 1883 the brewers have taken for their use 12,166,263 bushels of barley. This is an average of 760,391 bushels per year. So that instead of using 2,600,000 bushels per year, they have not used on an average much more than one-quarter that amount.

2. Q. Does the Canada Temperance Act prohibit farmers from making and keeping cider for their own use, or from buying and selling the juice newly pressed from the apples for vinegar making.

A. Not at all. The farmer can make and use as much cider as he pleases. He is not allowed to sell it by retail. He can sell by wholesale, but only to those who will remove it outside the limits of the prohibited district. The farmer can take his apples to the press, and buy or sell the newly-made juice for purposes of vinegar making. The Act has only to do with *intoxicating liquors*, and newly-pressed apple juice is not intoxicating.

3. Q. Can a man buy liquor outside the prohibited territory, and bring it into his own house and use it?

A. Yes. The law has no power outside of the county or city which has adopted it. A man can go to a city or county which has not adopted the Act and buy liquor. He can bring it home and use it, for the Act does not dictate to a man what he shall eat or drink. But he cannot *sell that which he has thus brought in.* The Act prohibits the sale.

4. Q. Does the Act make any distinction between rich and poor?

A. None. The Act has power only where adopted, and there it allows no sale of liquors to either rich man or poor man. All are treated alike. Any man can go to a city, not under the Act, and buy a quantity and bring it home. A long purse will enable the rich man to do this better than the poor man. But it is the *purse* that makes the distinction, not the *law.*

5. Q. Is it true that Maine had 17,800 arrests for drunkenness for the year 1873, as stated by the rum-sellers' advocate, and re-echoed by a prominent Hamilton newspaper ?

A. If you turn to the Attorney-General's report for 1873, for the State of Maine, you will find, not 17,800 arrests for drunkenness, *but* 17,800 *days' imprisonment* for drunkenness. So when a man in Maine is sent to gaol for six months for drunkenness, these ingenious and truthful champions of whiskey count him as equal to *exactly* 182½ *men!* 17,800 days' imprisonment, divided by 45, a short average of imprisonment per man, gives less than 400 persons imprisoned. So Maine really had about **400** persons imprisoned for drunkenness, instead of **17,800** !

6. Q. Is it true that there are more insane people in the asylums in Maine, under prohibition, than in Ontario, or other States under license ?

A. Read the following lists, which show the number of insane in the asylums of Maine, Ontario, and Massachusetts, at the end of the years indicated.

	Maine.	Ontario.	Mass.
1869	337	1,148	1,874
1870	345	1,200	1,964
1871	368	1,366	1,979
1872	393	1,461	2,034
1873	411	1,505	2,057
1874	393	1,599	2,204
1875	403	1,650	2,264
1876	405	1,812	2,354
1877	416	1,999	2,511
1878	418	2,149	2,794
1879	419	2,325	2,976

Please note—

1. The small yearly increase in Maine, and the relatively large increase per year in both Ontario and Mass.

2. The increase in these countries from 1869 to 1879 is, for Maine 24 per cent., for Mass. 60 per cent., and for Ontario 102 per cent. Maine, under prohibition, *has but one-third the increase of Mass. and but one-fourth the increase of Ontario, under license.*

3, In 1879, Maine has one insane person to every 1,551 inhabitants. Ontario one to every 780, and Mass. one to every 600. That is, Maine *has but half as much insanity in proportion to population as Ontario or Mass.*

NOTE.—It is but fair to state that Ontario's asylum system is of later date than Maine's, and so the yearly increase would naturally be somewhat greater for the first years.

7. Q. If a private person buys liquors outside the prohibited district, and brings them to his own house and keeps them for use, can a warrant be issued to search his premises and take the liquor ?

A. No. A warrant can, in such cases, only be issued to search for liquors bought *in the Prohibited District*, and in defiance of the Act, and only then, if the person who illegally sold them to you is being prosecuted for that sale.

8. Q. What shall we do for hotel accommodation, if the licenses are refused ?

A. Do the same as people do under prohibiting laws in other places, the same as they do in Maine, Vermont, Kansas, and in the Canadian counties and cities which have adopted this very Act. No one hears of any complaints in these places about lack of hotel accommodation. The demand for lodging, meals and stabling, is as great after prohibition as before, and the demand *will surely call forth a supply*. Of course, if you have at present three or four hotels at a little village or cross-roads, where one or two are quite sufficient for the needs of the travelling public, the others will have to go down. But that means simply so

many rumselling and boozing places less. The one or two that remain will be amply sufficient to care for the public, and will be able to make a good living thereby.

9. Q. Shall we not have to pay higher taxes if we lose the revenue from licenses ?

A. How much do you get for license fees ? Just take that amount and divide it by the taxable value of your county or city. That will give you the exact extra amount you would have to pay, supposing the county or city makes no saving. And in most cases you will be astonished at the trifling extra tax.

Then take the other side of it—the saving in criminal prosecutions, support of poor, cost of police and constables, and the money and labour saved, which otherwise would be spent in drink. This will far exceed the amount lost in license fees. It is calculated by statisticians that for every dollar coming into the public treasury from the liquor traffic, fully *five dollars* go out to provide for its waste and crime.

Save the manhood of the country and the taxes will take care of themselves.

10. Q. If we refuse to license the hotels, shall we not lose the market they make for produce, furniture, light, &c.?

A. What do the hotels require, meat, bread, milk, &c., for ? Not for their *drinkers*, but for their *eaters*. Will the public eat less when the "drink" is driven out! And if the public will eat just as much more, will not the hotels have to buy materials just as before ? The market will be made all the better if the bars be shut. Many a man who is now too needy to pay for a dinner or too drunk to eat one, will then be hearty and hungry, and able to pay.

11. Q. Does the county or municipality have to pay the expenses of the election held under the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act ?

A. No. The whole expense is borne by the Dominion Government.

12. Q. Can it be shown that the prohibiting sentiment of Canada has increased, is increasing, and bid sfair to prove triumphant at no distant date?

A. Yes:

1. By the successive passage of more and more stringent license laws in the Provinces for the last fifty years. Under them the traffic was delegalized in many counties of Nova Scotia, in some of New Brunswick, and in many municipalities of Quebec. It was put under severe regulation and restriction in all the Provinces.

2. By the enactment of the Dunkin Act in 1864, for Ontario and Quebec, and its adoption by large majorities in many towns and counties in both these Provinces.

3. By the passage in 1875, of the Prohibiting Laws for the North-West Territories, which forbid the manufacture, importation, sale and possession of intoxicants in all that broad area, except as permits for its use may be given by the Lieutenant-Governor. The incalculable good conferred by this law is everywhere acknowledged.

4. By the enactment in 1878, of the Canada Temperance Act, and by its having been triumphantly sustained up to July 1884, in 33 out of 40 contests in cities and counties in Canada. The total vote for stands at 49,100, in contrast to the total vote against of 26,944. This Act is now at work in two cities and 25 counties.

5. By the passage in 1883, of the Dominion License Law, which limits retail licenses to a maximum of one for each 250 people of the first 1000, and one for each 500 thereafter, forbids sale to minors; sale from seven o'clock Saturday night until six o'clock on Monday morning; sale on any election day; sale to drunkards, or persons for whom guardians or friends have obtained under the law an injunction forbidding it; gives three-fifths majority in any municipality power to prohibit; grants no new grocers' licenses and makes provision that all existing ones shall cease, in all but towns and cities in 1887, and in all Canada in 1890; and which puts

government officers to enforce this law or the Canada Temperance Act, if in force, in each county and city.

6. By the passage of the following resolution in Parliament in 1884, by a majority of 122 to 40.

Resolved, That this House is of the opinion that the right and most effectual legislation remedy for the evils of intemperance is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, and this House is prepared, so soon as public opinion will effectually sustain stringent measures to promote such legislation, so far as the same is within the compiling of the Parliament of Canada.

13. Q. How much money was spent in 1883, in the three leading Anglo countries for strong drink?

A. Study the following tables and see

WHAT THREE GREAT COUNTRIES SPENT IN 1883.

United States.	Gallons.			
Spirits (Home Manufacture).	82,631,972	at	$6 00	..$495,791,832
Beer "	.523,719,075	"	60...	314,351,439
Liquors (Imported)				100,000,000
				$910,143,271

Great Britain.	Gallons.			
Spirits (Home Manufacture).	28,713,997	"	20s	...£ 28,713,997
Spirits (Imported)....	8,235,738	"	24s	... 9,882,885
Wine (Foreign).....	14,382,983	"	18s	... 12,944,685
Wine (Domestic).....	15,000,000	"	2s	... 1,500,000
Beer.....	.965,809,440	"	1s 6d	... 72,435,708
				£125,477,275
			Or	$625,000,000

Canada.	Gallons.			
Spirits (Canadian).....	3,766,586	at	$5 00	....$18,832,930
Spirits (Imported)..... ..	1,004,075	"	6 00	 6,024,450
Beer (Canadian).....	12,178,820	"	60	 7,907,292
Ale and Porter (Imported)...	395,352	"	3 00	 1,186,056
Wines (Imported)..... ..	563,778	"	5 00	 2,818,890
				$36,769,618

SUMMARY.

	Cost.	Cost per head.
United States.....	...$ 910,143,271	.....$18 20
Great Britain.....	625,000,000	..... 17 85
Canada.....	36,769,617	..... 8 17
	$1,571,912,888	$17 46

CONCLUSION.

In the foregoing chapters, we have endeavoured to set forth some of the advantages of our Local Option Temperance Act; its principal provisions; the favour with which it has been received, and the results that have come from its proper enforcement. The history and success of Prohibition in Maine, in Massachusetts, and in numerous other places in the Old Country and in the New, have been briefly but comprehensively outlined. A comparison of statistics of Maine, under Prohibition, with Ontario and Canada, and various States of the Union under license, furnishes food for thought and a groundwork of unimpeachable fact for argument, while the more common objections to a Prohibitory Law in general, and to the Canadian Temperance Act in particular, have been dealt with shortly and suggestively.

It remains only to say a word in conclusion as to the necessity for prompt and immediate action.

By common consent intemperance is reprobated as a sin, and deplored no less as a social and national, than as an individual calamity.

No intelligent observer will, for a moment, attempt to deny that a large part of the intemperance of our people arises from the multiplied facilities for drinking which are set up and maintained by authority of our laws. These facilities act as a school in which the A, B, C, of drunkenness is taught to each generation of youth, and as powerful and invincible temptations to those whose appetite has been already set.

It cannot but be apparent, that in proportion as these drinking places are shut up, or made disrespectable, their influence is lessened, and consequently, sobriety becomes more general.

The Canada Temperance Act has been given us as the best instrument, which can, at present, be placed in our hands, by which the community may lay the ban of its disapproval upon the sin of drunkard-making, may take away the facilities for doing this, and make the doer of it respon-

sible in the eyes of the law, as he is now in the opinion of good men.

The measure of support that the people shall give to this Act will be an index both of their repugnance to, and condemnation of, the liquor traffic, and of their honest desire for laws that will entirely prohibit the iniquity.

Why, then, should we not awake to our responsibility, and show by our speedy and effective action that we are desirous of saving our country from the toils of its most insidious and threatening foe? Every age has some great work to do, either in preparation, in progress, or in fulfilment.

Our ancestors fought the long battles of physical, mental, religious, and political freedom, and we to-day enjoy the fruits of their labours, and rejoice in them. No slave-chains clank in all our borders; censorship of mind is a relic of the almost forgotten past. Every man worships God as he pleases, and none to molest him, while, above all, self-government raises its stable guarantee of liberty and security alike to individual and to country.

But it is the part of no true citizen merely to enjoy the goodly heritage, or yet to rest content with its bare preservation. These legacies of the past are as capital left in our hands out of which still greater gains shall accrue to our common brotherhood. There are heights yet to be scaled, and mountain tops for humanity from which the scene shall spread more beautifully, and the air blow more purely. And the good citizen, standing upon the solid rock of privileges already gained, and liberties firmly secured, will make of these but a vantage ground for the removal of what may yet fetter human progress or hinder the fuller happiness of mankind.

As the eye of citizen, philanthropist or Christian, sweeps the present or gazes out into the future, what curse looms up so darkly? What enemy of man works so incessantly or with such fatal results? To measure all the waste of wealth, the destruction of labour power, and the burdens caused by that poverty, crime and disease which are its constant out-

growths, would overtask the strongest powers of the most gifted political economist. To estimate the pain, the shame, the suffering and death of soul and body, which ever follow in its wake, would simply call for more than human capacity. For a vice which mocks the hopes of humanity and withstands the beneficence of Deity, this has no equal. What fatal inactivity is it which allows any good man to be for one moment idle or unconcerned in the face of so monstrous an evil, and one which stands full across the pathway of our country's progress?

This heritage, which we love to call our country, is a pleasant and fruitful one. No hills rise more beautifully to kiss the blue sky, no wide vales and fertile plains lie more invitingly before the husbandman, no great waterways bid for so vast a service, and the tides of three oceans beat upon her coasts. Her soil responds generously to the tiller's toil, her seas abound in rich treasures, her lap holds no niggard stores of mineral wealth, and no climate is better fitted to brace and tone the nerves of an industrious and intellectual people. The blood of the best races, refreshed and invigorated by her cool northern climate, flows in the veins of her people, and the newly-awakened national life leaps and thrills through her pulses . . . Surely industry, in this chosen abode, may well bless her loyal subjects with a liberal hand, and prosperity smile upon them from the waving fields, and loaded ships, and thronging business centres.

The Drink Traffic is the one evil spirit which hinders and confuses this rich promise of material progress. It seizes thousands of acres of our best land for its purposes, condemns men to toil at its behest, and then insults both nature and human labour by turning the millions of bushels of grain—God's gift for man's good—into a destructive poison.

It taxes its ingenuity to distribute the evil thing it has made over all parts of our country, exhausts every form of attraction to secure its consumption, and, as it pockets the hard earned money of the toilers, laughs its mocking laugh

in full sight of the labour it has paralyzed, the good it has wasted, the capital it has worse than sunk, the crime it has engendered, the poverty it has nursed, and the cruel deaths it has caused.

There is no greater enemy to Canada's material interests abroad this day than the wasteful, ruinous Drink Traffic. But while it overturns the home of plenty, it more cruelly still shatters the goblet of human happiness.

The Home comes with its tender ministry, its atmosphere of purity, its teaching of the good and true, its implanting of hopes, and its memories of enduring sweetness.

The School joins with its awakening of intellect, its unlocking of mysteries, its guidance into knowledge, its stirrings of high ambitions, and its culture of the noblest, and supplements the well begun work of the Home.

The Church adds her sacred fire, which touches into higher life the moral nature, her inspired hopes, her sufficient solace, her sweet reconcilements, her heavenly joys and infinite prospects.

This blessed Trinity of influences joins hands with our humanity, and leads it upwards towards the best.

But over against all these the Drink Traffic places its hostile camp, and gives them perpetual battle.

It robs the Home of its tenderness, fouls its purity, vitiates its teachings, blasts its hopes, and turns its memories into a burden of bitterness.

It antagonizes the School by locking up intellects in a pathetic idleness, by barring the path of knowledge to thousands of little children, by lulling all ambition in the dull lap of sensuality, and filling the soul with images of evil and degrading desires.

It undermines the Church by its subtle attractions, which lead the child from the Sabbath School, the worshippers from the sanctuary, and the preacher from the pulpit; by its unhallowed appetites and passions, which eat into the better moral nature, deaden the conscience and drown in their mad contentions every whisper of the better and heavenly.

Between the Home, the School, the Church, and the Drink Traffic there is as inevitable and continued a warfare as that between Heaven and Hell.

Think, honest reader, if you have no part in this battle, if you can be indifferent, if you dare to be neutral. Shall the cry of human suffering, which arises upon all sides from the poor trampled victims of the traffic, appeal to you in vain? Is it nothing to you that stone after stone is taken down from happy Canadian homes, thread after thread drawn from fair woven hopes, and that life's song is so often turned into the sad moanings of despair? Can you look into the child faces grown old before their time, the youthful faces all marred with vice and depravity, the matured faces disfigured with the revolting signs of sensuality and crime, the sorrowing faces so patient, so sad, and so hopeless; and yet trace behind them no finger of the Legalized Dramshop?

Is it a little matter that the tenderest ties which bind father to son, husband to wife, brother to sister, and hold homes in perfect harmony, should on all sides be ruthlessly torn asunder by that hand which gathers its motive and its force from this same Place of Iniquity? When Society needs its members, and Industry claims her toilers, and the Country asks for sterling citizenship, why should you passively or actively allow or maintain the pest of the one, the destroyer of the other, and the sworn enemy of the third?

Reader, Think, Ponder, Resolve, and Act.

This greatest of preventable evils can be prevented, this worst of slaveries can be abolished, this most crying of all national disgraces can be forever done away with.

And if we will but recognize in this the great work of our age, and undertake it cheerfully, courageously and hopefully, this century may behold in Canada a victory, which shall immeasurably add to the sum of human good, and remain for all time the fairest gem in all the coronal of our country's history.

THE END.

CANADIAN
TEMPERANCE LITERATURE

(By PROFESSOR GEO. E. FOSTER.)

Four page 24mo Leaflets. 20 cents per 100; $1.75 per 1000.

1. What is the Canada Temperance Act?
2. Objections answered.
3. The Rum Seller, what he is not.
4. The Rum Seller, what he is.
5. The Plea of the Child.
6. "It will Ruin Business."

Four page 8vo Leaflets. 35 cents per 100; $3.00 per 1000.

1. Is Moral Suasion sufficient?
2. The Ontario Trades' Benevolent Association.
3. How the Dramshops help Trade.
4. How the Dramshops pay the Taxes.
5. An Appeal to the Church.
6. Can we License the Traffic?
7. What we Waste in Drink.
8. Why we Try the Scott Act.
9. Is it Tyrannical and un-British?
10. Should we Compensate the Sellers?
11. The Barley Market, Sobriety by Law.
12. About Partial Prohibition—The Dunkin Act.

The Canadian Hand-Book of Prohibition.

New edition—revised and enlarged. The best hand-book on Prohibition yet published. Judge Black, of Pennsylvania,—*Invaluable for Prohibition Speakers and Workers.* Price 20 cts. per copy; $15.00 per 100.

ott Act—For and Against.

lete Scott Act Campaign Speech. Meets every objection. e circulated everywhere. Price 5 cts. each; 50 cts. per 00 per 1000.

of Fifty Years.

efore the Hamilton W.C.T.U.) An hisperance work. 28 pages; 6 cents per

MILTON, Ont.